WHITE-JEWISH GENOCIDE AGENDA OF SOROS-ROCKEFELLER, AND THEIR 'IRAN PROJECT', HAPPENS TO MESH WITH A NUCLEAR-ARMED IRAN: "DAYS AWAY" FROM WEAPONS-GRADE URANIUM BY 2025, BUT SOROS-RAN EU MOSTLY QUIET

By: Joel v.d. Reijden | **Date:** April 9, 2026 | PART OF THE "LIBERAL CIA" SERIES


99% of respondents expressed NIAC did not represent their interests
99% of respondents believed NIAC was a lobbyist for the Islamic Republic
Jan. 2026 Iran massacre. Continued in prison in Feb.
TEL AVIV, 2026
EU
UNITED NATIONS
Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Charles Koch
OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS
FORD FOUNDATION
TEL AVIV, 2025

"Iran could produce enough weapons-grade uranium for one bomb within days, and within weeks, enough for about 8-10 warheads. The IAEA would quickly detect [this] but [there] may not have enough time to respond..."

> ~ June 12, 2025 Arms Control Association report, which for the rest adhered to the Rockefeller-Soros-type globalist narrative that Trump and Netanyahu need to *"abandon"* their *"more extreme demand of zero enrichment."*[1]

CONTENTS

Main summaries

1. A simple problem, made so complex by Soros & co.
2. Iran was hellbent on making nukes, and very close
3. White and Jewish replacement: "liberal CIA" Soros-Rockefeller-EU-UN axis

Rockefeller-Soros: EU and UN control

4. UN-worshipping, anti-white, anti-Jew EU leaders controlled by Soros-Rockefeller network; Vatican a white suicide cult
5. *"Illegal war"*? *"International law"*? 1945 "UN Doctrine" obsessed over by EU leaders - under Rockefeller-Soros direction - is cultic, dangerous, limited and propagandist
6. The Joel Doctrine: integrating the Caroline, UN, and Bush Doctrines - in an honest manner

Rockefeller-Soros: Iran ties

7. Rockefeller working with Ayatollah Iran since 2002, joined by Soros and Koch; dictating Obama's 2015 flawed nuclear deal
8. **1979-2004:** Richard Falk: anti-establishment, pro-Ayatollah activist at the CFR, then AIC; finally a key 9/11 "truth" disinformer...
9. **1997:** American Iranian Council (AIC)
10. **2002:** The Iran Project
11. **2002:** National Iranian American Council (NIAC)
12. **2019:** Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft
13. Goal of Rockefeller-Soros-Koch working with nuke-obsessed Ayatollah Iran?

Poll data

14. 2025 U.S. polls: 80-86% oppose a nuclear armed Iran, but only 24% thinks it's an *"immediate ... threat."*
15. 2026 U.S. polls: 79-88% oppose a nuclear armed Iran, 75% think Iran is a present threat, 59% of adults "not opposed" to strikes - despite just 12% Democrat support for war
16. 2025 U.K. polls: 84% opposes Iran nukes, but 44% supports war
17. 2026 U.K. polls: 25% support for U.S. bombings; 44-20% male-female support for U.S. using U.K. bases
18. Polls summary: everybody worried about a nuclear-armed Iran, but mass "liberal CIA" propaganda stifles military support

Ayatollah Iran "Axis of Evil"-worthy

19. Low IQ, terrorist, genocidal, unhinged, and suicidal

Iran's nuclear program timeline

20. 1953-1979: "Atoms for Peace": U.S. and E.U. build nuclear reactors for Pakistani and Iranian dictators, amongst others
21. 1979-2000s: Siemens and Germany, Argentina, China, Russia and North Korea aid Ayatollah Iran with nuclear know-how and power plants
22. 2002-: Iran, with Syria and North Korea, repeatedly caught going rogue with its nuclear program
23. 2015 Obama-Iran nuclear energy deal: advantages
24. 2015 Obama-Iran nuclear deal: disadvantages
25. 2018-: Trump administration withdraws from nuclear deal
26. 2019-2025: Mainly as Trump leaves office, Iran quickly moves from 4% to 60% enrichment; has 11x the enrichment capacity by 2025
27. Jan. 2025-: Trump back in office, as Iran can produce a nuke *"within days"*

Middle East psychology & conclusions

28. You are not prepared for the mindset
29. The Mongol / Shighren solution
30. Only peace through global alliances and strength
31. Future problems: Middle Eastern countries receiving nuclear power; Japan enough plutonium for 5,500 warheads

32. Notes

"Iran could produce its first quantity of 25 kg of WGU [weapons-grade uranium] in Fordow in as little as two to three days. ... 25 kg of weapon-grade uranium (WGU) per weapon [is plenty]. ... Iran has no civilian use or justification for its production of 60 percent enriched uranium, particularly at the level of hundreds of kilograms. Its rush to make much more... raises more questions."

~ June 9, 2025 Institute for Science and International Security report. [2]

"The significantly increased production and accumulation of highly enriched [60%] uranium by Iran, the only non-nuclear-weapon State to produce such nuclear material, is of serious concern. ... Iran has neither provided technically credible explanations for the presence of uranium particles of anthropogenic origin at undeclared locations in Iran nor informed the Agency of the current location(s) of the nuclear material and/or of the contaminated equipment involved."

~ Feb. 26, 2025, IAEA Board of Governors briefing document. [3]

"The Intelligence Community [under President Biden] continues to assess that as of 26 September 2024, Iran is not building a nuclear weapon. Tehran has, however, undertaken activities that better position it to produce one, if it so chooses... Iran has continued to increase its stockpiles of 20-percent and 60-percent enriched uranium, manufacture and operate an increasing number of advanced centrifuges, and publicly discuss the utility of nuclear weapons."

~ Nov. 2024 Office of the Director of National Intelligence report. [4] The *"better position it"* conclusion was first (and thus very late) reached in a similar intelligence report to congress in Aug. 2024. [5]

MAIN SUMMARIES

A simple problem, made so complex by Soros & co.

Turns out, the simple part of this article - whose beginnings were based on Obama nuclear appendices in ISGP's 2017 ISIS article - was confirming

that Iran indeed was getting VERY close to developing nuclear warheads by early 2025. But once that was confirmed, much harder questions started popping up:

Polls

1. Why did only 24% of Americans think that Iran's nuclear program posed an *"immediate and serious threat"*? [6] In contrast to the facts?
2. Why, despite both agreeing to the tune of 79-86% that having a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is undesirable, did 77% of Republicans support military action versus just 12% for the Democrats? [7] That amount of polarization among the public does not seem normal, and is dangerous.

Western leaders

3. Why were so many EU prime ministers - not to mention soon also Canada - as opposed to the U.S.-Israel strikes as the average "liberal CIA" and antifa activist? Similar to their opposition to grabbing Maduro and trying to oust the Cuba regime? All terrible dictatorships?
4. Why did these EU leaders refuse to talk about Iran's very obvious desire for nuclear weapons? While only harping on about *"a violation of international law"* in relation to the U.S. and Israel?
5. Why did EU prime ministers and other leaders supportive of the Iran strikes get endlessly attacked by Soros-tied politicians - and generally "course correct"?
6. Why do almost all EU prime ministers have pre-existing ties to Soros, Rockefeller, or overlapping globalist groups built by the Rockefellers?

"Liberal CIA"

7. Aren't the "liberal CIA" Rockefeller and Soros foundations, along with the Ford Foundation, the European Union and United Nations, heavily financing a massive network of "grassroots" anti-Israel, anti-Jew NGOs and activists, both in the West and inside Israel?
8. Aren't these foundations not massive financiers of white replacement and white guilt too?
9. Aren't these foundations not also tied to long-term "private diplomacy" with Ayatollah Iran? Through the Iran Project since 2002? And at the same time tied to "Israel lobby" opposition?

As the reader can see, the situation is a lot more complex than merely the question whether or not the June 2025 and early 2026 U.S.-Israel strikes were justified. And these questions hit right at the heart of what ISGP is all about: privately-funded supranational influence on national governments.

Iran was hellbent on making nukes, and very close

We get deeper into this later on in this article, but here is a key summary of facts surrounding Iran's nuclear program:

1. Many people have warned over the decades that **countries as Iran and Pakistan should never have been included in the 1950s-1970s utopian globalist 'Atoms for Peace' program**. This Rockefeller and USAID-tied program is the root cause of the problem, followed by countries as Germany, Argentina, Russia and China aiding Ayatollah Iran in its nuclear program from 1979 on; in turn followed by the rise of the globalist white and Jewish genocide agenda funded by foundations as Rockefeller, Ford, and Soros - coincidentally also tied to the Iranian Ayatollah regime and the weak 2015 Obama nuclear deal.

   The end result of all these policies always would have been war, nuclear or preventive, because Ayatollah Iran never played by any rules, apart from its own - as everything below demonstrates.

2. Only after Trump left office **in 2021, did Iran start refining uranium to 60%.** [8] For a peaceful nuclear program, **Iran has no need to refine uranium above 3.67%.** [9] **Anything above 20% cannot be justified** for research purposes either [10], but even before the 2015 Obama nuclear deal, restricting Iran to 3.67% uranium only, Iran already had refined uranium to at least 27%. [11]

3. **By early 2025, Iran had the option to create enough weaponized uranium (90%) for a first nuclear warhead within *"two to three days"*** [12], with there potentially not being any time to stop it, especially not in case of (more) hidden refining capabilities. [13] This is something the Arms Control Association (ACA) and the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS), based on reports from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), all concluded. See the quotes near the top of this article.

4. Due to dramatically increasing, ever more high-tech, refining capabilities, Iran could reduce its nuclear *"break out time"* from *"two to three days"* in 2025 to hours within a few years. [14] Back in 2015-2018, with uranium at 3.67% and old centrifuges, break out time still was estimated at 12 months. In 2022 it had gone down to 6 months, with projections from this Biden administration period being rather peculiar underestimates, as it was clear that Iran was making up its own rules by enriching to 60% since 2021 [15] and continually installing more advanced centrifuges. [16] By August 2024, just before the Democrats (once again) lost the election to Trump, U.S. intelligence, in a report to congress, finally removed the annual assessment since 2019 that, *"Iran is not currently undertaking ... key nuclear weapons-development*

activities..." and replaced it with the much more accurate conclusion that Iran has *"undertaken activities that better position it to produce a nuclear device, if it chooses to do so."* [17] This conclusion was repeated in a U.S. intelligence report a month later. [18]

5. Before the 2015 Obama nuclear deal, **Iran was caught on numerous occasions trying to hide all kinds of aspects of its nuclear program** from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). This has involved research, uranium refining, likely plutonium and tritium production (heavy-water), and theoretical nuclear weapons testing. A list of when such major breaches of IAEA were discovered and-or exposed:

    1. **1989-2003:** Covert uranium research program - known as the "AMAD Plan" - to try and develop nuclear ICBM warheads. [19]
    2. **2002:** A secret nuclear facility in Natanz. [20]
    3. **2002:** A secret nuclear facility in Arak. [21]
    4. **2004:** Unreported procurement of nuclear program parts. [22].
    5. **2004-2007:** A secret nuclear plant at Al Kibar in Assad's neighboring Syria. [23]
    6. **2006-2009:** A secret underground refining facility in Qom. [24]
    7. **2011:** Hidden past research on nuclear warheads and detonators. [25]
    8. **2012:** Unreported uranium enrichment up to 27%. [26]
    9. **2004-2015:** Suspected nuclear weapons-tied tests and subsequent cover up at the Parchin military base. [27]
    10. **June 2022:** Iran shuts down IAEA surveillance cameras at Natanz, Fordow and other locations after the IAEA *"criticized Iran for not explaining the presence of uranium traces at three sites it had not declared to be part of its nuclear program."* After a lot of criticism, the cameras finally are turned on again in May 2023, but this still resulted in an *"irreversible ... knowledge gap"*. [28]
    11. **Feb. 2023:** Two Fordow centrifuge cascades are configured *"substantially different"* than reported, and are generating uranium particles up to a whopping 83.7%. [29] Supposedly it involves a mistake. [30]
    12. **June 2025:** The IAEA reveals that *"a few years ago"* they found out that Iran had been spying on the agency, acquiring confidential IAEA documents on its assessment of the Iranian nuclear program. [31]

6. It is true that "break out time" is not the same as "bomb time", as it takes additional steps to convert the weaponized uranium into an actual bomb, and also to additionally miniaturize it from there to fit onto a missile. Estimates have ranged from 3 months to 1 year for Iran

to move from having weapons grade uranium to having its first nuclear bomb, and, moving towards a year, possibly even a nuclear missile warhead. [32] However, in 1964 China did it in *"three to five weeks"*, having all the key components already lying in wait. [33] We don't know what Iran has lying ready. But even beyond that, it seems needlessly risky, destabilizing, and completely silly to allow Iran to even enrich so much uranium to 60%.

7. Iran only extremely reluctantly entered the 2015 Obama nuclear deal - which also involved EU countries, Russia and China - out of fear of a U.S.-Israeli attack. But just because Trump stepped out of the deal in 2018, does not mean that Iran had any moral or practical right to go back to blackmailing the entire world with its nuclear program, and continue to obstruct the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

8. Why the Bush 43 government prioritized a 20-year pointless Afghanistan War, or an Iraq War based on clearly manipulative statements, over controlling Iran's very real nuclear development, is yet another interesting question. Similar to why the Bush government was so afraid to bomb a joint Syrian-Iranian-North Korean nuclear reactor in Syria in 2007 [34], or why it allowed Hamas to be electable during the 2006 Gaza elections. [35]

9. Its Tehran and Arak nuclear research reactors have given Iran the ability to produce **cesium-137**, **cobalt-60**, and **americium 241**. That could be a big issue, as it could poison whole cities and countries with it when using it for dirty bombs. [36]

White and Jewish replacement: "liberal CIA" Soros-Rockefeller-EU-UN axis

The above facts have been reported in the media over the past decades. So why are the above facts so unknown to most westerners? Why haven't they been summarized and reported everywhere in the run up to the wars against Iran? Well, because directly or indirectly, literally everything is about bashing Trump - who represents "white people" - and Israel, the home of "the Jews". To be more precise, looking at:

1. the dominant English-language liberal-globalist media;
2. the dominant non-English-language liberal-globalist media, including my own unfortunately very prominent Dutch gateway, Nu.nl, which regularly covers up Iranian atrocities; and the supposedly "rightish" De Telegraaf [37];
3. their heavily censored and propagandized comment sections;
4. the algorithms feeding content to users on Instagram and TikTok;

5. Google with its shamelessly downranked conservative content from 2019 on;
6. comment sections of a Google-owned YouTube;
7. the new anti-Israel alliance between alt right and antifa gurus;
8. prominent podcasters and conspiracy disinformers;
9. politicians from center-left and even many alt-right parties;
10. and the armies of Soros and Ford Foundation-financed "liberal CIA" and antifa activists occupying universities, campaigning against Israel...

... it appears that Trump and Israel are almost universally to blame for being "the aggressors" in their attacks on Iran in 2025 and 2026. It's pretty much the only view allowed, whether explicitly or implicitly through selective reporting and biased content algorithms. Make no mistake, 88% of the time that the term "war crime" was used in relation to the Iran conflict in early 2026, it referred to the U.S. and Israel; and not even once solely in relation to anything Iran did or has done. [38] It's very reminiscent of Trump receiving only 5-8% positive news from all these same media outlets in 2017-2018, vastly less than even a George W. Bush. [39] Not much has changed since then.

That's a big problem, because over time it will lead to more and more people in society having warped views of reality. Or just plain be missing facts, such as the imminent nuclear danger Iran posed by early 2025. I certainly had no clue, until reading up about everything Iran has been doing, and has been caught doing, since 2002.

We discuss the Rockefeller-Soros ties to Ayatollah Iran in a future section. Immediately below, we discuss the views of western leaders, and check for any peculiar globalist ties.

ROCKEFELLER-SOROS: EU AND UN CONTROL

UN-worshipping, anti-white, anti-Jew EU leaders controlled by Soros-Rockefeller network: Vatican a white suicide cult

Most shocking, at least to this author, is that even prominent European political leaders by 2025 and 2026 were very reserved in expressing support for the U.S.-Israeli attacks on Iran. Some did initially, but through the EU structure and media pressure pretty much were forced into shutting up. In fact, very prominently it has been reported how a large number of European heads of state fully condemned the U.S.-Israeli attacks on Iran as an *"illegal ... violation of international law."* This contrasts quite a bit with Sunni Arabian countries hit by Iran, who

actually rather quickly became major supporters of the U.S. and Israel smashing Iran to such an extent that it would cease being a military threat. [40]

So, did these European leaders provide extra details of what "international laws" were broken? No. They just repeated those words, and off they went again, as good little puppets. Or, as another person called it: parrots. [41] The "laws" hinted at are old, limited, and cultic. They belong to the 1945 United Nations Charter, but it appears western leaders are hesitant to make their people aware just how much they worship this (anti-white and anti-Jew) institution. We'll get back to that later though. Let's first cite a good number of western leaders on the 2026 U.S.-Israel war against Iran.

Actually, after a little checking, in addition it turned out that many of these political leaders had peculiar globalist ties, either to the traditional "Rockefeller establishment" surrounding Bilderberg, the Trilateral Commission, and groups as Atlantik Brucke; or a much more Israel-hating "liberal CIA" clique subset of "Rockefeller globalism", this one surrounding George Soros. Let's summarize the views of these leaders, roughly from the most aggressively against, to the most favorable:

1. **Italian prime minister (Oct. 2022-) Giorgia Meloni (Long-time leader of the neofascist MSI party, which merged with Berlusconi's conservative party - both tied in with the CIA-riddled Cercle network):** Considered an ally of the Trump administration and Israel. In January 2026 she called Trump grabbing Maduro *"legitimate defense"* due to Maduro's drug trafficking activities that can be seen as *"hybrid attacks on [America's] security"*. [42]

   In March 2026 though, with Trump destroying Iran's nuclear and military infrastructure, Meloni turned into a full-blown left-wing United Nations globalist. Staring down at a paper without looking up, Meloni read the following statement to Italian congress:

   > *"[We're talking about] unilateral interventions carried out beyond the established framework of international law, among which we must also include the American and Israeli intervention against the Iranian regime. ... Italy does not intend to take part. [It's] an escalation which Italy in recent months instead has been committed to avoiding."* [43]

   If this wasn't enough, Meloni upped the anti-U.S. propaganda by in addition reading up:

   > *"I express our firm condemnation for the massacre of the girls that occurred at the Minab school in southern Iran... [Let] those*

responsible for this tragedy be quickly identified."[44]

Accidents in war happen, in this case apparently because the school was housed in what previously was a military base. There's no need to crusade over this particular issue at this early stage, in such a typically "outrage" manner, unless you're looking to discredit what are supposed to be your allies.

2. **Spanish prime minister (2018-) Pedro Sanchez (founding participant in the Macron/Soros-founded Paris Peace Forum in 2018; president of the super-antifa Socialist International 2022-; Davos 2022-2026):** Spain under Sanchez is the only NATO country that refused to commit to a heightened spending of 5% of its budget on defense, and received a special deal for it in June 2025. [45] This author actually agrees with that, very much suspecting efficiency is lacking. That doesn't mean that Sanchez is "social" at all. Like all socialists, he's a white genocide-obsessed antifa. In January 2026, in a move more extreme than the regular EU bureacracy even, his government decided to legalize half a million illegals in Spain. [46] When the U.S.-Israel war with Iran broke out a month later, similarly as a good antifa, Sanchez withdrew his Spanish ambassador in Israel, called the war illegal, supported Iran proxies dominating Gaza and Lebanon against Israel, and championed the antifa-inclined Unites Nations. Interestingly, very much like a dictator, he said he spoke for *"the whole of Spanish society"*:

> *"This illegal war in Iran [is] a war that the Spanish government, and I would say the whole of Spanish society, have condemned from the very beginning - that we do not support, that we consider illegal... We are already beginning to suffer [through] the cost in human lives, displaced persons, and refugees, [and the] economic impact...*
>
> *"I do not want to forget neither Gaza, nor the situation in Lebanon. ... We are going to count on the presence of the secretary general of the United Nations. I think it is very important that the message is transferred by the European Council [in favor of] strengthening the system of the United Nations."*[47]

Eventually Sanchez did acknowledge that the son of the slain Ayatollah *"is an equally dictatorial and even more bloodthirsty tyrant than his father."*[48] You would think that Sanchez would want a regime like that to be removed and not have any chance of getting close to nuclear weapons. But clearly not, because days later, on March 30, while Gulf states were pushing Israel and the U.S. to continue the war

to prevent Iran from ever becoming a threat again [49], Sanchez instead closed Spanish airspace to all U.S. warplanes. [50]

3. **French President (2017-) Emmanuel Macron (Partner in the Rothschild & Cie Banque 2010-2012, in 2008 hired here through Alain Minc, who was a founding member of George Soros' European CFR in 2007. Bilderberg 2014. In 2018 Macron set up his antifa, anti-Israel, anti-white Paris Peace Forum with Alex Soros, meeting him almost every year here with world leaders.):** On March 4, Macron said: *"The United States of America and Israel decided to launch military operations, conducted outside international law."* Added something very cryptic: *"The fact remains that history never mourns the executioners of their people, and none will be missed."* [51] Later on he added: *"Fighting should stop ... to try to give negotiations another chance."* On March 17, he added: *"We are not party to the conflict and therefore France will never take part in operations to open or liberate the Straight of Hormuz in the current context. ... De-escalation with Iran, because in no case can it be an operation of forceful action."*[52]

4. **British prime minister (2024-) Keir Starmer (Trilateral Commission 2015-, initially still under David Rockefeller):** For weeks Starmer blocked the U.S. from using its domestic and (U.S.-shared) Diego Garcia air bases. Only on March 20th, when the air war pretty much was over, he opened up the airbases in a limited manner, and only in relation to opening the Strait of Hormuz. [53]

5. **EU foreign and security policy chief (2024-) Kaja Kallas (daughter of a banker, EU commissioner and PM Estonia 2002-2003; long-time Soros agent through her European CFR council membership from 2016 [54] to 2024 [55]; herself PM of Estonia 2021-2024; Bilderberg 2024 visitor, just before her EU appointment):** On March 17, Kallas said, *"We were not consulted with the objectives of this war. ... This is not Europe's war."* [56] Even before finding out about her long-time ECFR membership, just looking for the video in which Kallas made this statement, she comes across as a total Soros agent:

    1. On Iran she went, *"Diplomacy is the only way out."*[57]
    2. She keeps talking about working with the United Nations on everything: against Jewish settlers, about funding the International Criminal Court (think the case against Israeli prime minister Netanyahu), and against apparent U.S.-Russia (Trump-Putin)-collusion over the back of Europe. [58]
    3. When she claims she got 26 of 27 European foreign ministers on board for sanctions against Israeli settlers, this is quite unsettling, as it proves how unified control is. [59] Days after this original

article, Victor Orban in Hungary was defeated, immediately resulting in a push towards "majority vote" in EU decisions. [60]

6. **Pope (2025-) Leo XIV (Leo's immediate predecessor, Pope Francis, was a pro-immigration antifa who for his Vatican negotiated business/social deals with the "liberal CIA" Rockefeller and Ford foundations, as well as Lynn Forester de Rothschild):** Similar to his predecessor, Pope Leo is an antifa, only concerned with non-whites and non-Christians. Quickly after his installment, he began attacking Trump over his "anti-immigration" policy against illegal invaders. [61] At the same time, whenever there was a new Israeli ground offensive, he would express his *"profound closeness to the Palestinian people in Gaza."* [62] Even Christmas 2025 he dedicated to *"those who have nothing left..., like the inhabitants of Gaza."* [63]

   Predictably, from the start, Pope Leo kept calling for "peace" in the Iran conflict through all kinds of vague, superficial statements [64], eventually suggesting that Trump and Netanyahu's *"hands are full of blood"* because *"they wage war"* [65], ironically suggesting the West should just commit suicide: *"[Jesus Christ] did not arm himself, or defend himself, or fight any war. ... Rather than saving himself, he allowed himself to be nailed to the cross."* [66] It appears this makes the Vatican a (white and Jewish) suicide cult.

7. **Dutch PM (Feb. 2026-) Rob Jetten (David Rockefeller fellow of the Trilateral Commission 2020-2023):** On March 19 fresh Dutch prime minister Rob Jetten - who was elected on the lie that he was "pro-Netherlands" - walked around at an EU Summit in Brussels with a happy glow on his face like "he made it." His speech came across as rehearsed, just as the manner in which he suddenly turned around and walked away from the media. As one might expect, his views were similar to other European leaders:

   > *"This is a war that was started by the United States and Israel against Iran on reasons that I can understand, because the Iranian regime is brutal... But it is not a war that we are part of. ... It's too volatile to start a mission in the Straight of Hormuz. So we need to focus on deescalating... more sanctions ... and support for the democratic forces in Iran."* [67]

   After being asked what should happen with Iran after the war, he seemed to insinuate that the Trump government should not exert its influence: *"It's ONLY up to the Iranians to decide the future of Iran."* [68]

8. **Austrian chancellor (2025-) Christian Stocker:** Center-right politician. On March 3, 2026, Stocker sounded quite supportive: *"Iran is a threat not only to Israel and other states in the region, but also to us."* [69] Two weeks later, at the EU summit, for the longest time he only talked about how Austria secured his own energy supply. When finally prompted, he said:

   > *"This is not an issue for Austria anyway. ... It is a question for NATO... [And] the EU member states [say] they do not want to be drawn into this conflict, which was not started by us. ... The actions of the United States are difficult to predict [and their] strategy here is difficult to discern. I do not know how they will react, but Europe and Austria will not allow themselves to be blackmailed [through U.S. tariffs?]."* [70]

9. **Unelected Canadian prime minister (2025-) Mark Carney (Governor Bank of Canada and Bank of England. Davos regular 2008-, and trustee since at least 2015. Bilderberg 2011-2012, in 2011 still with David Rockefeller.):** Carney most notably has been recorded on March 3 saying that *"it appears that these actions are inconsistent with international law."* [71] However, looking deeper, Carney actually has been supportive of the attacks, saying, *"Nobody has a civil nuclear programme that's buried a mile beneath the desert."* At the same time, he regretted that the U.S. and Israel went to war *"without engaging the United Nations or consulting with allies, including Canada."* [72]

10. **German chancellor (May 2025-) Friedrich Merz (chairman Atlantik-Brucke 2009-2019; Bilderberg May 2024):** On March 3, 2026, sitting with Trump at the White House, Merz said: *"We are supporting the United States and Israel to get rid of this terrible, terrorist regime, and we are looking forward to the "day after" [as to] what is following after this regime is away. ... We are having a high interest in a common approach."* [73] Fascinatingly, the first question a reporter asked Trump during this meeting was, *"Mr. President, did Israel force your hand to launch strikes against Iran?"* [74]

    In any case, two weeks later, Merz was accused of doing a u-turn. Similar to Kallas, he started complaining that the U.S. and Israel *"did not consult us prior to this war"* and that therefore *"it has been clear at all times that this war is not a matter for NATO. [It's got] nothing to do with NATO."* [75] Similar to other leaders, such as Dutch prime minister Rob Jetten, he uttered the following peculiar "toothless tiger" words: *"There is a lot we can do, including opening sea lanes and keeping them clear. But we won't do that while hostilities are ongoing."* [76]

Eventually he seemed to join the Iranians in mocking the United States [77], leading to Trump withdrawing American troops from Germany. [78]

- German president **Frank-Walter Steinmeier (speaker at the 2007 "grand opening" of George Soros' European CFR [79] and a regular public supporter of Soros [80]; as foreign minister, around 2015, he met with Iranian regime respresentatives on the sidelines of Davos [81], as part of a key negotiator of the 2015 Obama nuclear deal [82]; continued to visit Davos in 2019; visitor Munich Security Conference in 2025, etc.):** The German president seems to have been cited in the press in March as a counterweight to German chancellor Friedrich Merz and German European Commission president Ursula von der Leyen, both of whom supported the attacks on Iran. As can be seen above, the socialist Steinmeier is a long-time Soros agent, and seems tied-in with the Rockefeller-Soros Iran Project. [83] So his opinions are extra predictable:

  > *"This war violates international law. There is little doubt that, in any case, the justification of an imminent attack on the U.S. does not hold water. ... A truly avoidable, unnecessary war, if its goal was to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. ... Just as I believe there will be no going back to the way things were before February 24, 2022 in our relationship with Russia, so I believe there will be no going back to the way things were before January 20, 2025 in transatlantic relations. The rupture is too deep."*

11. **EU Commission president (2019-) Ursula von der Leyen (visitor Davos since at least 2013; Bilderberg 2015-2017, 2019)):** Initially very supportive of the U.S.-Israel attacks on Iran:

    > *"You will hear different views about whether the conflict in Iran is a war of choice or a war of necessity, but ... I want to be clear: there should be no tears shed for the Iranian regime. This regime has inflicted death and imposed repression on its own people. They slaughtered 17,000 young people. And this regime has caused devastation and destabilization across the region through its proxies armed with missiles and drones. And many Iranians inside the country and across Europe and the world have celebrated Ayatollah Khamenei's demise, as have many more people across the region. They hope that this moment can open a path towards a free Iran. And I think the people of Iran deserve freedom."* [84]

Checking up on how this rather supportive pro-Trump statement was

received within the European Union, it turns out that Von der Leyen was attacked in the media by a number of individuals. Her speech, as posted by Sky News and other on YouTube channels, was pretty much 100% blasted by rabid antifa trolls [85] - which really is not a normal thing. In the meantime newspapers brought forward a variety of esteemed critics of Von der Leyen's speech:

1. One was *"prominent MEP and former French minister, Nathalie Loiseau"*, who complained that Von der Leyen was *"usurping the role of the EU foreign policy chief, Kaja Kallas"* and was *"going further than Kallas"* in supporting the war against Iran. Funny detail: Nathalie Loiseau is a council member of Soros' European CFR [86], where Kallas had just stepped down from after almost a decade.

2. Another attack from France involved "French ambassador" Gerard Araud, who, also referring to EU foreign policy chief Kallas, complained that Von der Leyen was *"acting outside of her competence."* [87] That's all nice and well, but Araud has been a trustee of Soros' International Crisis Group since 2019. [88]

3. Kallas' predecessor as EU foreign affairs and security chief, Josep Borrell, complained about Von der Leyen's position. Coincidentally, he too is a member of Soros' European CFR. [89] He's also operates as a socialist under the earlier-listed Spanish prime mininister Pedro Sanchez.

4. French foreign minister Jean-Noël Barrot, working under Soros-ally French president Emmanuel Macron, also criticized Von der Leyen, by pointing out that Von der Leyen is not in charge of the European Union's foreign policy: *"The High Representative [Kaja Kallas is the one who] directs the Union's common foreign and security policy."* [90] However, Barrot pretty much operates as an anti-Israel, pro-Maduro [91], and pro-Ayatollah activist for the French government. He happens to have been part of the Macron-Soros-Rockefeller-ran Paris Peace Forum while climbing the ranks under Macron. He certainly visited the annual meeting of the forum in 2022, while still a minor "minister delegate".

5. French big business leader Thierry Breton was another critic of Von der Leyen, complaining: *"When the Commission [under president Von der Leyen] behaves like an autonomous diplomatic actor, duplicating or contradicting the message of heads of state and government, it dilutes the European voice."* [92] Breton happens to be persona non grata in Trump's United States since

late 2025. He is a member of the elite club Le Siecle, whose membership list still is only partly known to the public.

6. European Council president Antonio Costa, European Commission vice president Teresa Ribera, and Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats leader Iratxe García - Spanish socialists allied with Spanish prime minister, Davos visitor, and Socialist International president Pedro Sanchez - all attacked Von der Leyen with the same argument: *"It is essential that Europe today resolutely defend the value of international law."*[93]

"Illegal war"? *"International law"*? 1945 "UN Doctrine" obsessed over by EU leaders - under Rockefeller-Soros direction - is cultic, dangerous, limited and propagandist

The "international law" endlessly hinted at by anti-Iran War heads of state and EU officials left many citizens wondering what laws even were being referred to. Just one example is a Facebook post of the *"inconsistent with international law"*-speech of Canadian prime minister Mark Carney, where other relevant observations were made as well:

Yassaman I. (top comment at 182 likes, but most are antifa-type): *"With all respect, and I do respect you, has the regime in Iran in the past 47 years ever acted according to international law?"*

Steve C. (28 likes): *"'International law, International law'. He sounds like a parrot."*

Mei Yao J. (22 likes - with 48 liking the answer): *"Which law is it?"*

Anonymous: *"He hasn't a clue [as to what law]."*

Arni W.: *"Sorry for my ignorance, but what is "international law"? It seems to me that there is no such thing. ... There is no international court system that adjudicates "international law"..."*

Anonymous: *"He definitely doesn't know what it means."*

Arni W. (4 likes): *"R2P [Right to protect] for Iranian people, this is an international law."*[94]

As already mentioned, the laws Mark Carney and other politicians hinted at are to be found in the 1945 United Nations Charter. In particular, we're talking about Article 2(3-4):

> *"3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.*
>
> *"4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force..."*[95]

In addition there is Article 51 of the same United Nations Charter that gives a member country the right to self-defense, albeit it in a very limited manner only:

> *"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs... until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."*[96]

Back in January 2026, when the Trump administration grabbed Maduro in Venezuela, a number of people who would denounce the Iran War in March, made similar referrals to "international law", but explicitly linked it to the United Nations as well. For example, on January 3, 2026, EU foreign policy and security chief Kaja Kallas - the earlier-discussed long-time Soros agent - stated:

> *"I have spoken with [U.S.] Secretary of State Marco Rubio... The EU has repeatedly stated that Mr Maduro lacks legitimacy and has defended a peaceful transition. Under all circumstances, the principles of international law and the UN Charter must be respected. We call for restraint."*[97]

That same day Emmanuel Macron's foreign minister, Jean-Noël Barrot, released a similar statement:

> *"The [U.S.] military operation that led to the capture of Nicolas Maduro violates the principle of non-use of force, which underpins international law. France reiterates that no lasting political solution can be imposed from the outside and that sovereign peoples alone decide their own future. ... [France] reiterates its commitment to the Charter of the United Nations..."*[98]

Ironically, China did so as well:

> *"We urge the US to abide by international law and the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and stop violating the sovereignty and security of other countries..."*[99]

Uruguay's government might be important to cite in this regard as well:

> *"Uruguay rejects ... military intervention by one country in the territory of another and reaffirms the importance of respecting*

> *international law and the UN Charter, in particular the basic principle that States must refrain from resorting to the threat or use of force against ... any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."*[100]

The Venezuelan ambassador to the United Nations, after his boss had been kidnapped by the United States, directly cited the United Nations Charter. [101] So did Mexican president Claudia Sheinbaum. [102] Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who would be next on the menu and killed on February 28, complained about the American intervention in Venezuela. So, of course, did Russia.

All of this is hilarious, of course. Plenty of countries referring to the United Nations Charter of non-intervention in other countries, have been doing so non-stop for many years. Russia, China, and Iran by definition all are major, recent examples of this. Basically all the countries who have the power to do this, do so, except maybe European countries these days neutered under Soros and the globalist system.

Furthermore, the creators of the soft laws of the United Nations apparently were in such a hurry that they were written down in June 1945, when World War II still was raging in the Far East against Japan for over two months. Subsequently, these laws were never updated. As a result, it is not surprising that a few questions have been asked whether or not these laws are complete. One argument that emerged in the 1950s, and generally has been seen as valid still today [103], is that the 1945 United Nations Charter did not replace the Caroline "Charter" of 1837 - a judicial conclusion that read:

> *"It will be for [a] Government to show a necessity of self-defence, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation."*[104]

That obviously still leaves countless holes in "international law" that are easy to exploit by any powerful nation:

1. Development of nuclear weapons, even more so without any overt threats.
2. Creation of a massive army - such as Hitler did pre-World War II.
3. Causing massive amounts of pollution, affecting neighboring and global countries.
4. Genocides largely swept under the rug by the United Nations, such as the one in Ayatollah Iran in January 2026.
5. The Cold War system of proxy wars, and really still beyond, that has to be countered.
6. All kinds of additional covert operations, from hacker groups to terrorists fronting for foreign nations.

I came up with these examples in a matter of seconds. And these questions have been asked over the decades, albeit not nearly enough. One example is the Oxford and Harvard-educated legal expert Dr. Julius Stone (1907-1985) in his 1958 book 'Aggression and World Order: A Critique of United Nations Theories of Aggression'. From a review of the time we read:

> *"Much of the literature concerning aggression in international law assumes that members of the United Nations today have given up all self-enforcement rights save that of self-defense. According to this view, any resort to violence that is not in self-defense or in pursuance of a U.N. decision constitutes aggression and is illegal. Specifically, articles 2(3) and 2(4) are often interpreted to this effect. ...*
>
> *"ALL recourse to violence in the relations between states constitutes war; all war is aggression; and all aggression (save response to prior aggression) is illegal. This is the position of [League of Nations technical adviser (since 1924) and later United Nations International Law Commission member] Georges Scelle as set forth in 1934 and maintained unchanged since that date; and it is this position [that has been] defended at various times by many other scholars and, with greater or less modification, by various states..."* [105]

The review is so convoluted that I wasn't able to distill any alternative suggestions, such as the ones I gave above. And that right there is the problem: it seems to be "not done" in "accepted" academic circles to do so, because the Rockefeller clique has been so dominant in setting up and maintaining the League of Nations and United Nations structure, not to mention politics in general.

Then again, speaking of the "Rockefeller clique", most notably one of David Rockefeller's most important right-wing Republican associates, George Shultz, this person, in 1984, presented an alternative and-or updated foreign intervention doctrine to the United Nations Charter. On October 25, 1984, at Park Avenue Synagogue in Manhattan, Shultz, as Reagan's secretray of state (1982-1989), held a speech in which he said the following:

> *"If we are not willing to set limits to what kinds of behavior are tolerable, then our adversaries will conclude that there are no limits. As Thomas Jefferson once said, when we were confronted with the problem of piracy, "an insult unpunished is the parent of others." ...*
>
> *"Our responses should go beyond passive defense to consider means of active prevention, pre-emption and retaliation. Our goal must be to prevent and deter future terrorist acts...*

> *"Some will seek to cast any pre-emptive or retaliatory action by us in the worst light and will attempt to make our military and our policy makers - rather than the terrorists - appear to be the culprits. ... Occasions will come when [the public's] government must act before each and every fact is known... Public support for U.S. military actions to stop terrorists before they commit some hideous act or in retaliation for an attack on our people is crucial if we are to deal with this challenge."*[106]

Shultz spoke these words three years after the Israelis preventively bombed Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor, which was being constructed at the time. Even right-wingers as Margaret Thatcher and Jeane Kirkpatrick went off the deep end, criticizing Israel. [107] However, maybe more level-headed people would think it is absolute madness to allow a murderous, Israel-hating dictator as Saddam Hussein to have a *"nuclear energy programme, then in its infancy and certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency as peaceful."*[108] Or expect the Israelis to just sit back and let Hussein build it. It's probably for the best Israel bombed it, because we would have been having a second Iran on our hands.

After 9/11, the doctrine of preemption was formalized under the neocon-leaning George W. Bush administration as the "Bush Doctrine". Shultz, as one of the top leaders of the Hoover Institution, similar to his old buddy Henry Kissinger, was an informal advisor to the Bush government, which in many respects was a continuation of the Reagan administration that Shultz was secretary of state of.

The problem, of course, with the Shultz and Bush Doctrine is that it is only sound in theory. In practice, the pretext for the Iraq War was based on very obvious manipulation of evidence. Certainly already criticized by "liberal CIA" media outlets from the start [109], this manipulation then provided additional fuel for claiming that the more restrictive, similarly Rockefeller-tied United Nations Charter is correct after all.

The Joel Doctrine: integrating the Caroline, UN, and Bush Doctrines - in an honest manner

It's the typical globalist game: poison pills as far as the eye can see. There is no good side to pick, so you have to resort to a third way. So with this, I introduce the 'ISGP / Joel Doctrine' here as the basis for 'international law'. This simply comes down to 'practical problem solving'. Any country can attack another in case of:

1. **Self defense:**
   - An actual attack from another country.
   - An anticipated imminent attack by another country.

- An anticipated future attack in the longer run by another country, whether through structurally hostile statements, an irresponsible arms build up, or a build up of specific weaponry that is costly or impossible to counter.
- After strong evidence of irregular warfare from another country, mainly through terrorist and drug trafficking front groups, as well as the promotion of mass immigration.
- To prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction, especially among hostile, radical, low IQ states that on top of that break countless oversight rules of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

2. **For the greater good:**
   - Aiding other countries in preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction.
   - Aiding other countries in freedom struggles.
   - To prevent mass pollution.
   - To prevent domestic genocides.

This will give United Nations-tied politicians and pencil-neck legal scholars lots and lots to complain and debate about. Does this wider doctrine - which completely undermines the power of the United Nations - open the door towards more abuse? Maybe. But countries will always resort to twisting and manipulating the truth, as they do under the highly restrictive and prematurely centralized UN Charter as well. The idea of the 'Joel Doctrine' is to simply let countries be countries, and to let the most high IQ countries flourish into becoming more peaceful and cooperative over time. Intellect is needed for that. The globalist United Nations arguably has the opposite agenda, despite what it publicly claims to stand for.

An attack on Iran is easy to legitimize under the 'Joel Doctrine', whether through hostile statements, a nuclear program, that on top of that is rogue; dangerous, aggressive ICBM development [110]; or domestic genocide. In fact, attacking Iran already was easy to legitimize by Israel under the United Nations Charter, as Israel was in obvious Iranian proxy war attack for a long time. The fact that most of the United Nations doesn't like Israel, and doesn't want any other country helping it, is little more than trolling. The fact that its charter was used to prevent it from taking any measures against the January 2026 Iran genocide, or the fact that Maduro in Venezuela caused 8 million of his citizens, or 20% of his population, to flee abroad, is a joke as well.

I doubt many ordinary citizens would disagree with the 'Joel Doctrine'. And once ordinary (white and Jewish) citizens find out what a maze of pro-white genocide, pro-Jewish genocide, Rockefeller, Soros, and "liberal CIA" globalism the United Nations is, they will abandon it all together.

Maybe one day there will be a trustworthy supranational structure that individual countries in the world can put their trust in. But such an organization does not exist today.

ROCKEFELLER-SOROS: IRAN TIES

Rockefeller working with Ayatollah Iran since 2002, joined by Soros and Koch: dictating Obama's 2015 flawed nuclear deal

To this author, the largely "hands off" situation that the "liberal CIA"-allied aspects of the West employ with regard to a nuclear Iran, became more fascinating still in late 2025 upon learning about three tightly interlocking "liberal CIA"-backed groups: the Iran Project, the National Iranian American Council (NIAC), and the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft. Most notably the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and George Soros were backing these groups, albeit over time also by the "alt right"-funding, similarly anti-Jew / anti-white Koch Foundations.

From there though, the trail let to an old fascination of ISGP: the American Iranian Council (IAC), founded in 1997. And there's more than that as well.

1979-2004: Richard Falk: anti-establishment, pro-Ayatollah activist at the CFR, then AIC; finally a key 9/11 "truth" disinformer...

First, we really need to discuss a person here, instead of an institute. Already pre-September 11, 2001 (9/11), a person with the name of Dr. Richard Falk sat on the advisory council of the to-be-discussed American Iranian Council. That's very interesting, as Falk has been controlled opposition his entire life. In 1971 he clashed within the CFR with its chairman, David Rockefeller, about the group being too much of an "insider club". This was widely reported in the New York Times at the time. [111] A predictable explanation of Falk in 2004, through co-author David Ray Griffin, makes little sense:

> *"As to the Council of [sic] Foreign Relations, Richard became a member in about 1969, he says, and has "remained a member despite a variety of misgivings." Although he was between trips when I caught up with him to ask him about this, I can imagine he has remained a member with the thought of perhaps having some positive influence. ... One example of his trying to have an influence on CFR was what he describes as "a huge fight with David Rockefeller over the appointment of William Bundy as editor of Foreign Affairs.""* [112]

The thing, David Rockefeller, who was chairman of the CFR from 1970 to 1985, and also had either mentors and close associates running the CFR in other periods, doesn't tolerate any opposition, unless it is controlled opposition.

Eight years later, in 1979, the Shah is overthrown by the Ayatollah regime. This is widely seen as a problematic issue in the West. But not by Richard Falk, who emerges as the biggest supporter of the new regime. Just as conveniently as he was allowed to challenge the "status quo" in David Rockefeller's CFR in 1971, in 1979, just as conveniently, Falk is given space in the New York Times to express his support for the Ayatollah regime. Falk wrote:

> *"Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini ... has been depicted in a manner calculated to frighten. President Carter and [national security advisor] Zbigniew Brzezinski have until very recently associated him with religious fanaticism. The news media have defamed him in many ways, associating him with efforts to turn the clock back 1,300 years, with virulent anti-Semitism, and with a new political disorder, "theocratic fascism," about to be set loose on the world."* [113]

Well, "virulent anti-Semitism" and "theocratic fascism" is exactly what happened. But Falk, a decades-long professor at the WASP-dominated Princeton University, also never stood still. Already before 9/11 (Sep. 11, 2001) [114], under the Bush and Obama administrations, which almost included a war against Iran as well, Falk was a member of the national advisory committee of the anti-Zionist, anti-neocon and pro-Saudi oil Middle East Policy Council. He still was a member by 2015. [115] The council is part of the pro-Saudi oil network and was headed for a long time by the globalist elitist Chas Freeman, who in 2009 saw his appointment as chairman of the National Intelligence Council squashed by "the Israel Lobby". [116] 2001-era MPEC directors as Frank Carlucci - a deputy CIA director, national security advisor, secretary of defense, Carlyle Group chairman, and old college friend of 9/11 secretary of defense Donald Rumsfeld - and Henry Kissinger protege Richard Armitage, tie Falk rather closely to individuals who have been unofficial suspects in the 9/11 event. We find more of those elite ties of Falk at the to-be-discussed American Iranian Council, where he also sat on the advisory council pre-9/11 already. [117]

All the is extremely interesting, because post-9/11, Richard Falk became the person to write the foreword to Dr. David Ray Griffin's well known October 2004-released book 'The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11', timed right after the 9/11 Commission released its report and the disinformative *Pentagon Strike* flash video was making headlines in the Washington Post and related newspapers. All the popular 9/11 conspiracy theories were

included in the book without seemingly any fact-checking or any original research. Claims that Flight 77 couldn't have hit the Pentagon were prominently included, a view that Griffin holds on to to this day, despite a widely spread 2005 ISGP article fully undermining this disinformation.

Both Griffin and Falk have written books on globalization, for the first time together in 1993. [118] Ironically, also with David Ray Griffin, Rockefeller ties and antifa views weren't far away. A 2004 email of Griffin, to the usual fellow conspiracy disinformers (they always ran away from this author):

> *"To suggest that Richard [Falk] does not really want the [9/11] truth exposed, or that he is doing this for some nefarious reason, is simply inexcusable. Perhaps John Gray will forgive you, but I confess that I will have difficulty.*
>
> *"John Cobb ... was formerly my professor and then my colleague at the Claremont School of Theology and in the Department of Religious Studies at Claremont Graduate University, where he taught from the late 1950s until he retired 15 years ago. ...*
>
> *"Cobb and I founded the Center for Process Studies... Our first conference [was] to discuss problems in the neo-Darwinian theory of evolution and to consider an alternative to it. It took place at the Rockefeller Foundation's Study and Conference Center at Bellagio, Italy. The arrangement is that if they accept your application and you can pay the way for all the conferees to get there, they give you room, board, and a meeting place for 3 or 4 days. That has been the extent of our center's support from the Rockefeller Foundation. Cobb and I acknowledge this support in the Preface of the resulting book, 'Mind in Nature: Essays on the Interface of Science and Philosophy'.*
>
> *"Incidentally, I personally, as an individual scholar, went back to [the Rockefeller's] Bellagio in 1992, where my wife and I stayed for about 5 weeks. It was there, in fact, that I first developed the conviction that if the world's global problems are to be solved, we need to move from the present global structure--technically known as global anarchy--to global democracy. This past year I applied to return, with the hope of finishing a book that I started the day after 9/11. But this time my application was denied. Perhaps I was foolish to reveal my topic: global democracy as the only, or at least the best, way to overcome US imperialism."*[119]

In the email, Griffin forgot to mention at least one additional connection to Laurance Rockefeller, as documented in his 1997 book

'Parapsychology, Philosophy, and Spirituality: A Postmodern Exploration':

> *"My debts in relation to this book are enormous. I will begin by thanking Laurance Rockefeller, who, by providing funding for a conference in 1990, allowed me to get to know and learn from many of the best scientists and philosophers within the parapsychological community. Without the writings of several people fitting that description, this book would not have been possible."* [120]

Conclusion? David Ray Griffin and Richard Falk were lifelong controlled opposition CIA disinformers, except that, as usual, their CIA ties cannot be proved; only their Rockefeller ones.

1997: American Iranian Council (AIC)

The American Iranian Council was founded by Hooshang Amirahmadi, who served as the group's president as well. Amirahmadi is familiar to ISGP, because in 2008 he gave a speech to the secretive CIA, MI6, Opus Dei, and Knights of Malta-riddled Cercle Pinay. He seemed a bit out of place for the arch-conservative group, but then again, over a period of more than 70 years Cercle Pinay changed its character at least a bit.

The persons involved in his American Iranian Council also are familiar. They have included close Rockefeller globalist Cyrus Vance as founding honorary chair in 1997 until his death in 2002. [121] While I can't locate it anymore, a picture exists of Amirahmadi and Cyrus Vance talking at an American Iranian Council meeting with George Soros - which must have been in 2002 or earlier. Furthermore, the following individuals were early board members, and are names that need to be remembered throughout this entire section:

1. Chas Freeman. [122]
2. Frank Wisner II. [123]
3. Thomas Pickering. [124]

Dr. Richard Falk, discussed in the previous section, sat on the board of the American Iranian Council pre-9/11 already [125], emerging as a key 9/11 "Truth" disinformer in 2004. That alone strongly indicates that the American Iranian Council - early on loaded with (vice president Dick Cheney's) Halliburton, Chevron, ExxonMobil, ConocoPhilips, and Boeing executives [126] - was tightly mixed in with the security services, similar to Falk and Chas Freeman's Middle East Policy Council (MEPC).

Frank Wisner II and Thomas Pickering we will discuss in the next section, or sections. As for Chas Freeman, a major Rockefeller-type globalist, he too is to be found in ISGP's Superclass Index. He visited Bilderberg in 1996 and held positions such as trustee of the "liberal CIA"

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (2010-2016), vice chair and lifetime director of the Atlantic Council, and board member of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations (NCUSCR) and U.S. China Policy Foundation (USCPF). He knew everybody through these think tanks, including Henry Kissinger. As said, in 2009 Freeman saw his appointment as chairman of the National Intelligence Council squashed by "the Israel Lobby". [127] Eventually, in 2019, Chas Freeman played a behind-the-scenes consultancy role in the forming of the "liberal CIA", very anti-Jewish Rockefeller-Soros-Koch-backed Quincy Institute [128], which still needs to be discussed.

2002: The Iran Project

The Iran Project was founded in 2002 by Rockefeller Brothers Fund, apparently using the similarly globalist elite-tied United Nations Association as a front for additional legitimacy. So much is obvious from the fact that William Luers, the United Nations Association person who co-founded the Iran Project with the Rockefeller Brothers, himself was a long-time Rockefeller Brothers Fund trustee. In 1998 Luers actually had been forced to step *"down as a trustee [of RBF] in June after serving three three-year terms, the maximum permitted by the by-laws"*, but subsequently *"was elected an advisory trustee"*, alongside other former trustees as David and Laurance Rockefeller. He remained an advisory trustee until at least 2006. The core team of the Iran Project was dominated by the Rockefeller family as well, not to mention George Soros:

> *"The Iran Project is led by former RBF trustee William Luers [with] a core group including Ambassadors Luers, Thomas Pickering [of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission and co-chair and chair of George Soros' International Crisis Group] and [1998-2007 RBF trustee] Frank Wisner, MIT nuclear expert Jim Walsh, and RBF President [since 2001, until at least 2026] Stephen Heintz. ...*
>
> *"For more than a decade The Iran Project encouraged the expansion of diplomatic communication with [Ayatollah] Iran and supported the multi-lateral negotiations that culminated with the Iran Nuclear Agreement of June 2015. The RBF continues to fund the Project... Its core objectives have been to reduce tensions between Iran and United States and help resolve the nuclear impasse..."* [129]

Eventually the Iran Project got its own website, giving us more insight in the American names [130], but not the Iranian ones. It turns out that back in 2001-2002 the Iran Project recruited Iran's long-time deputy foreign minister and incoming ambassador to the United Nations, Javad Zarif, to pick the persons on the Iranian side to negotiate with on Iran's nuclear

and ICBM programs. [131] Like anyone who touches the Rockefellers, Zarif ended up doing very well for himself:

1. Iran's deputy foreign minister for Legal and International Affairs 1992-2002. [132]
2. Chairman of United Nations General Assembly legal committee 1992-1993. [133]
3. President of United Nations Disarmament Commission in 2000 [134], a commission focused on both nuclear and non-nuclear disarmamant.
4. Key founder of the Rockefeller's Iran Project when part of Iran's UN mission in 2001, helping to select Iranian participants. [135]
5. Iran's ambassador to the UN 2002-2007. [136]
6. Chairman of UNESCO's Cultural Commission 2007-2009. [137]
7. Iran's foreign minister 2013-2021. [138]
8. Iran's chief nuclear negotiator 2013-2015. [139]
9. Iran's vice president for strategic affairs August 2024 to March 2025. [140]

Not much is known about the details of Iranian participation in the "Rockefeller negotiations", as they arguably should be called - except that Zarif's Ayatollah bosses didn't care much about curbing Iran's nuclear program or ICBM development. We'll get back to Zarif later.

The first meeting of the Iran Project took place in Sweden in December of 2002. The timing and names of all this match very closely with a "confidential" recap memo of Dr. Hooshing Amirahmadi, the founding president of the American Iranian Council from 2002 on. In his note, Amirahmadi summarized:

> *"**February 2002:** Iran makes a counterproposal [to the U.S.] for direct negotiations over [the looming] Iraq [invasion]... through UN Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan. The US rejected the idea because they did not want to involve Russia and China in the negotiations. Thomas Pickering and [old Henry Kissinger[protege] had tried to convince Ambassador Javad Zarif to prepare Iran for the American proposal. ...*
>
> ***September 2002:** A select number of AIC Boards meet ambassador Zarif at this residence (including, Tom Pickering, Frank Wisner, Hooshang Amirahmadi, and Richard Murphy). Zarif just arrived from Tehran as Iran's new [U.N.] Ambassador. Significantly, Ambassador Pickering ... spoke to the State Department and was told that the US is prepared to normalize relations with Iran. It was agreed that AIC organizes a conference [to] announce their intention to normalize relations.*
>
> *"[The same month] a select group of AIC Board members meet Iran's*

> *Foreign Minister, Dr. Kamal Kharrazi, at the residence of Dr. Zarif. It was at this meeting that Iran, through the Foreign Minister, for the first time, expressed that it wants to normalize relations with the US [without] conditions for negotiations. The expression was like a bomb drop for all of us. Ambassador Pickering delivered that message to the State Department."*[141]

As the reader can see, the key names of the Iran Project - Thomas Pickering, Frank Wisner and Javad Zarif - are all there, at the right time. So clearly the Rockefeller Brothers Fund piggy-backed on the renewed U.S.-Iranian diplomacy - initially through the American Iranian Council - to start its Iran Project in late 2002. It may well have done so based on a request or with formal approval from the U.S. State Department.

Subsequently, the Iran Project held *"more than a dozen meetings from 2002 through 2008."* [142] Meetings continued after 2008, with another source reporting at least 15 times in total until at least 2016 - until after the initially secretive 2015 Obama nuclear deal had been struck. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund lobbied hard for this deal through the National Security Council and State Department, with Rockefeller Brothers Fund president Stephen Heintz attending *"probably around five or six"* meetings of the Iran Project at both departments. [143]

The interesting thing is, until putting together this article, it always bothered me a bit that George Soros did not seem to be involved in the Rockefeller's Iran Project until his Open Society Foundations helped lobby in favor the 2015 Obama nuclear deal. However, checking up in detail on the biographies of "core team" members Frank Wisner II and Thomas Pickering [144], it turned out that these individuals maintained close Soros ties. In fact, Thomas Pickering, as co-chair and then chair of Soros' International Crisis Group [145], was a full stand-in for Soros. Hence, it can be concluded that the Iran Project, from very early on, always was joint Rockefeller-Soros project. For those who want additional details on Wisner II and Pickering, below some of these men's more key globalist ties have been summarized. To illustrate, both men were part of ISGP's Superclass Index: Wisner in the top 70 for the U.S., with lifetime involvement in over 30 NGOs. With lifetime involvement in at least 81 NGOs, Thomas Pickering has always been a top 10 globalist, even when many of David Rockefeller's closest friends still were alive.

Frank Wisner II:

1. Son of infamous CFR member and CIA covert operations chief Frank Wisner (1909–1965). Wisner was CFR from before the CIA even existed and tied in with the "old boys" surrounding the Dulles brothers, James Jesus Angleton, Richard Helms and the Rockefellers.

2. Vice chairman of External Affairs, American International Group (AIG), anno 2002. AIG was headed by Maurice Greenberg, a very close ally of Henry Kissinger and other close friends of David Rockefeller in maintaining the globalist think tank network.
3. Chair of International House, New York City, the board historically filled with David Rockefeller and closest friends as John McCloy (chair 1954-1971, David mentor as chairman of Chase bank and the CFR), Henry Kissinger, John Whitehead, Paul Volcker, and even Daisy Soros, George Soros' sister-in-law. [146]
4. Trustee of Rockefeller Brothers Fund from December 1998 until 2007, with Iran Project founder William Luers [147]; and David, Laurance and eventually Steven C. Rockefeller as advisory trustees; and Richard Rockefeller - a son of David - as chairman. He was organizing all kinds of international meetings with RBF president Stephen Heintz. [148]
5. Anno 2001 a board member of Refugees International, a group he ran with George Soros and Soros agent Trish Malloch Brown. [149]

Thomas Pickering:

1. 1955 Fulbright Scholar, similar to Henry Kissinger - to whom he ended up serving as an assistant - and many other future globalists who seem to operate in deep cover-type globalist roles.
2. Bilderberg 1994.
3. Member Trilateral Commission 2003-2019.
4. Co-chair from April 2006 to 2010, chair from 2010 to 2014, co-chair again by 2014 [150], executive committe member from 2014, and trustee until at least 2019 of George Soros' International Crisis Group.
5. Anno 2019 on the advisory board of Refugees International, together with Soros agent Mark Malloch Brown. Refugees International we just mentioned as having been ran by George Soros, Soros agent Trish Malloch Brown, and Frank Wisner II in the late 1990s and the 2000s. [151]
6. Director anno 2004 and later life director of the Atlantic Council, together with the likes of Henry Kissinger, Kissinger proteges Brent Scowcroft and Lawrence Eagleburger, George Shultz, Shultz proeteg Condoleezza Rice (anno 1998; later national security advisor and secretary of state), Zbigniew Brzezinski and Rupert Murdoch (both international advisory board), James Woolsey, Chas Freeman, Gen. Wesley Clark, etc., etc.
7. Advisory council of Business Executives for National Security (BENS) until 2012, resigning the same year as Henry Kissinger.
8. U.S. co-chair of the United Nations Association.
9. Co-chair anno 2020 and chair anno 2023 of Better World Campaign, a Ted Turner founded United Nations lobby for closer cooperation

with the U.S.

10. Members-at-large of the Ted Turner, Rockefeller Foundation and United Nations-tied Institute for Global Development.
11. Member of the 2009-founded CIA External Advisory Board.
12. Founding member of the 2011-founded Foreign Affairs Policy Board of the State Department.
13. Trustee of the "liberal CIA" Carnegie Corporation 2003-2011.

These aren't nearly the only ties of these individuals, and we also ignored their formal government ties. Hence, it should be clear that we are dealing with a whole new level of goverment here: a privately-funded superclass that has backdoors into in all kinds of western governments at the highest level. And we will see more evidence of that.

2002: National Iranian American Council (NIAC)

Overlapping interests with the Rockefeller's Iran Project: *Iranian ambassador Javad Zarif, top-level Rockefeller-Soros globalist Thomas Pickering, and long-time funding of, and strategizing with, Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Soros' Open Society Institute / Foundations.*

First things first: in 2011 99% of Iranians and American Iranians polled stated that NIAC was a lobby for Ayatollah Iran, did not represent their interests in any way, and should have its finances disclosed:



NIAC OPINION SURVEY

OPINION SURVEY OF NIAC AND ITS PRESIDENT TRITA PARSI

PRO-DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT OF IRAN
(PDMI)
JULY 2011

KEY FINDINGS

The Pro-Democracy Movement of Iran (PDMI) conducted an on-line[i] bilingual (Farsi-English) survey of Iranians, Iranian- Americans and Americans in order to gauge attitudes towards NIAC and its president Trita Parsi. Respondents constituted a representative sample of 1,851 individuals age 18 and older who had access to the Internet. The survey's key findings are that:

- A majority of respondents had known NIAC for 1 to 5 years
- 99% of respondents expressed NIAC did not represent their interests
- 99% of respondents believed NIAC was a lobbyist for the Islamic Republic
- 90% of respondents were aware of the defamation lawsuit against Hassan Dai
- 82% had read NIAC's internal documents revealed as a result of the lawsuit
- 99% of respondents believed that NIAD has defrauded the federal government
- 99% of respondents believed that NIAC had lied to members of Congress about its membership numbers
- 88% of respondents were familiar with Bob Ney and his conviction
- 85% of respondents knew that Trita worked for Bob Ney
- 73% of respondents knew about Roy Coffee and David DiStefano
- 74% of respondents knew that NIAC worked with Roy Coffee to establish a lobby organization
- 82% of respondents said that they were never asked for their opinion by NIAC
- 1% of respondents believed that NIAC was a human rights organization and 99% believed that NIAC worked as a Lobby for the Islamic Republic
- A large majority of respondents wanted NIAC to disclose its financial documents, membership list and numbers, and be held accountable for its actions

A year later, in 2012, a U.S. judge threw out a libel case filed by NIAC founder Trita Parsi, because the presented evidence against Parsi was *"not inconsistent with the idea that he was first and foremost an advocate for the [Ayatollah] regime."*[152]

Considering the group's top-level Democrat, "conservative CIA" and especially "liberal CIA" ties, and its role in bringing about the questionable 2015 Obama Nuclear Deal, those are all very interesting viewpoints.

NIAC was founded in 2002 Trita Parsi, who served as president until 2018, when the 2015 Obama nuclear deal fell apart under President Trump. Emails released through a court case revealed that he had been *"a close friend of Iranian foreign minister Javad Zarif"* since March 2006, from the time when Zarif was Iran's United Nations ambassador in New York City. [153] As already discussed, as a co-founder of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's Iran Project in 2002, Zarif was a Rockefeller agent. His career has also already been mentioned, but let's repeat it:

1. Iran's deputy foreign minister for Legal and International Affairs 1992-2002. [154]
2. Chairman of United Nations General Assembly legal committee 1992-1993. [155]
3. President of United Nations Disarmament Commission in 2000 [156], a commission focused on both nuclear and non-nuclear disarmament.
4. Key founder of the Rockefeller's Iran Project when part of Iran's UN mission in 2001, helping to select Iranian participants. [157]
5. Iran's ambassador to the UN 2002-2007. [158]
6. Chairman of UNESCO's Cultural Commission 2007-2009. [159]
7. Iran's foreign minister 2013-2021. [160]
8. Iran's chief nuclear negotiator 2013-2015. [161]
9. Iran's vice president for strategic affairs August 2024 to March 2025. [162]

In 2020 it came out that Trita Parsi had been photographed with Javad Zarif and his team in Lausanne in March 2015, during the Obama nuclear deal negotiations. [163] So were two media team members of NIAC, who joined NIAC in 2014. They were photographed smiling very intensely with Zarif, with the National Council for Resistance of Iran - which revealed Iran's secret nuclear facilities in Natanz and Arak in 2002 [164] - commenting that *"senior Iranian regime officials do not take pictures with people unless they are certain of their utmost loyalty."* [165]

In addition to the Zarif, we have the Iran Project's most elite member, Thomas Pickering, a top 10 Rockefeller-Soros globalist, sitting on the advisory council of NIAC from 2008 [166], all the way to 2019 [167], until after Obama's Iran deal was canceled by Trump.

The ties until here already make it clear that NIAC and the Iran Project effectively were the same entity. But there's more overlap, as NIAC's key financiers and allies have been the Jew- and white-hating "liberal CIA" foundations that also were behind the Iran Project: the Rockefeller

Brothers Fund and Soros' Open Society Foundations. Soros certainly gave to NIAC early on, in the 2002-2005 period. [168] Rockefeller Brothers Fund has been regularly paying NIAC over at least the 2013-2022 period. [169] In 2022 and 2023 Rockefeller and Soros interests also were closely coordinating with NIAC staffers to revive the Obama nuclear deal. This included a December 3, 2022 meeting at the Rockefeller's Pocantico Hills estate. Koch was mentioned in relation to the strategizing as well. [170]

Finally, the U.S. State Department's Sahar Nowrouzzadeh needs discussing. Nowrouzzadeh was an early intern / scholar at NIAC. [171] In 2005 she entered the U.S. government and was rapidly promoted up the ranks. Eventually she helped implement and oversee the 2015 Obama nuclear deal through her senior positions at the National Security Council (2014-2016) and State Department (2016-2017) [172], until President Trump, in the wake of conservative media controversy, had her demoted in April 2017. [173] Afterwards, she was provided with a position at elite Belfer Center at Harvard, which had running an Iran Project of its own.

The story of Sahar Nowrouzzadeh pretty much sounds like an infiltration of the U.S. government on behalf of Iran, the Rockefellers, and the Democrats - assuming one takes the disastrous policies of this network into account, as well as the fact that NIAC was considered by 99% of Iranians and American Iranian a front for Ayatollah Iran. It's very peculiar.

As one might predict, Trita Parsi has been getting around the "conservative CIA" and "liberal CIA" network, from Steve Bannon [174] to Democracy Now!. [175] He has the same views as these groups, namely that the "imperialist" U.S. should withdraw from the Middle East. It all shows you how debate in our society all in contrived by people who work from some kind of invisible globalist intelligence agency.

2019: Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft

Overlapping interests with the Iran Project and NIAC: *Trita Parsi (of NIAC, and at least through Iranian foreign minister Javad Zarif with the Iran Project), William Luers (key founder Iran Project), top Rockefeller-Soros globalist Thomas Pickering (all three groups), as well as Rockefeller, Soros and Koch funding and strategizing.*

In 2019, NIAC's Trita Parsi became a founding executive vice president of the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft. Other Iranian interests were involved, most notably founding board member Francis Najafi, with his Pivotal Foundation as a donor; and the Nasiri Foundation. [176]

Primarily though, seed financiers of the 2019-founded Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft were "liberal CIA" foundations as Rockefeller Brothers Fund, on whose Pocantico Hills retreat - which we just

discussed in relation to NIAC - the founding meeting took place; Soros' Open Society Foundations and the so-called "right-wing" Koch Foundation. [177] "Liberal CIA" foundations Ploughshares and Arca also were listed as donors in 2019, with founding chair Suzanne DiMaggio prominently being listed at the time as a *"senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment"*, another major "liberal CIA" foundation. [178]

We can keep going with the overlaps:

1. Trita Parsi, head National Iranian American Council (NIAC) from 2002 to 2018, was a co-founder and executive vice president of Quincy. [179] Chas Freeman, a behind-the-scenes consultant on the founding of Quincy and a top Rockefeller-type globalist, actually fingered Parsi as *"the main organizer ... perhaps [due to] his disappointment as head of NIAC [which he left in 2018, a year before.]"* [180]

2. Official 2002 Iran Project founder William Luers, as a 1998-2007 trustee of Rockefeller Brothers Fund and head of the United Nations Association, ended up becoming a founding "distinguished fellow" of Quincy. [181]

3. Top Rockefeller-Soros globalist, Iran Project "core member", and long-time NIAC advisor Thomas Pickering was a founding board member of Quincy as well. [182]

So are the Iran Project (2002-), National Iranian Council (2002-), and the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft (2019-) completely and totally joined at the hip? With Rockefeller and Soros and the key financiers and drivers? No doubt about it.

In line with the heavy anti-Israel financing of these foundations, the board and fellows of the Quincy Institute have included a group of "anti-Islamophobia" and "Jewish lobby" critics, most recognizably Stephen Walt (fellow anno 2019-2020; non-resident fellow anno 2022; director anno 2024-2025) and John Mearsheimer (fellow anno 2019-2020; non-resident fellow anno 2022-2025), who co-authored the well-known 2007 book 'The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy'. [183] There are all kind sof propagandists to be found along these lines, with more being identified in the Quincy Institute listing in ISGP's NGO oversight. On the board, we can find other familiar names, such as "liberal CIA" journalist Katrina vanden Heuvel, a daughter of the OSS/CIA-tied Pilgrim William vanden Heuvel.

Goal of Rockefeller-Soros-Koch working with nuke-obsessed Ayatollah Iran?

As the reader can see, Rockefeller men as Thomas Pickering and George Soros really have been busy since the late 1990s and early 2000s to establish diplomatic relations with Ayatollah Iran. Eventually they heavily lobbied for the 2015 Obama nuclear deal, which also, coincidentally, due to the lifting of sanctions in 2015 ended up making an estimated $25 billion for Pickering's long-time employer, Boeing, by 2016. [184] Pickering was criticized over this. [185]

But even ignoring the corporate ties, which also included various oil firms, these interests:

1. all are perfectly aware that the Iranian regime has been ignoring all possible oversight rules with its nuclear program, and clearly was working towards nuclear weapons;
2. successfully lobbied for a flawed and originally secret 2015 nuclear deal that allowed Iran to shift development to highly advanced ICBMs, crucial in delivering future nuclear payloads, and ended being an absolutely menace during the 2025 and 2026 wars;
3. have been working with the regime's U.S. lobby NIAC in preventing criticism on this (murderous) regime and getting Democrats to support another dangerously ineffective nuclear deal;
4. together with the EU and UN, have been pouring billions upon billions into undermining the existence of Israel, both within Israel and through activists networks in the West;
5. have been pouring countless more billions into promoting mass Third World immigration, the white replacement and white guilt agenda;
6. have friends at the United Nations as the Instagram and TikTok-famous Jeffrey Sachs, a top 20 globalist and close Soros ally who always rages against historic U.S. and western imperialism, radicaling the entire Third World against the West - while protecting China;
7. have been interested in replacing the G7 with the G20 [186];
8. have been working with people that say that Israel should relinquish its nuclear weapons in order to guarantee a peaceful utopian *"nuclear weapon-free framework"* for the Middle East [187], not paying attention to the fact that 10 million Jews are opposed by 2 billion very angry Muslims, one country of which already has nuclear weapons.

So you look at this list, and the number question that pops up is: are these Rockefeller-Soros interests actually quietly interested in having a nuclear Iran nuke Israel out of existence? Followed by the West?

It's not a rational agenda, so it seems. But really nothing above that they finance and organize is. So it's a key question to get an answer to.

POLL DATA

2025 U.S. polls: 80-86% oppose a nuclear armed Iran, but only 24% thinks it's an *"immediate ... threat."*

Polls often reflect the will of the people. But maybe in case of the U.S.-Israel attack on Iran they largely reflect a lack of education about the facts, media and social media brainwashing, a lack of "togetherness" among western countries, immigrant opinions, and fears about the economy.

1. In 2009 Pew polls showed the vast majority of people in the West saw Iran with nuclear weapons as a problem: 68% in Great Britain (shockingly low), 74% in France, 78% in Italy, 79% in Germany, 81% in Spain, and 82% in the U.S. Bizarrely, only 27% in Ukraine thought this was a problem, and 41% in Russia. In general, Eastern Europe didn't get above 69% for the Czech Republic. [188]

2. A June 2025 poll, by "lefty" CNN, showed that 79% of all adults opposed Iran having nuclear weapons. This involved *"83 percent of registered Republicans, 79 percent of independents, and 79 percent of Democrats."* [189]

3. A Harvard University Harris poll, days after the above CNN poll, revealed that 85% of Democrats and 86% of Republicans did not want that Iran develops a nuclear bomb. [190]

4. In June 2025, *"78% of those [Americans] questioned said they were very or extremely concerned about Iran obtaining a nuclear bomb [and] majorities of Republicans (82%), Democrats (69%) and Independents (62%) agreed that Iran poses a [present] threat."* [191]

5. However, just 24% of Americans believed that Iran's nuclear program posed an *"immediate and serious threat."* [192]

6. As a result, at the time only 16% of Americans were interested in joining Israel in the war on Iran, with 60% opposing, respectively 53% (Republicans), 61% (Independents), and 65% (Democrats). [193]

7. Interestingly, despite opposing strikes on Iran the most, *"Democrats are more likely to expect Iranian retaliation in the U.S. (63%) than Independents (51%) or Republicans (48%)..."* [194] This leads one to think that opposition to the Iran war is fear-, weakness-, and propaganda-based.

2026 U.S. polls: 79-88% oppose a nuclear armed Iran, 75% think Iran is a present threat, 59% of adults "not opposed" to strikes - despite just 12% Democrat support for war

1. In a Marist poll, it was noted that between June 2025 and March 2026, there was an increase from 64 to 70% of Republicans who perceived Iran to be a *"major threat"*. However, among Democrats and Independents, these numbers actually went down, respectively from 38% to 27% and from 45% to 40%. Many more did agree though that Iran was a *"minor threat"*, such as 46% of Independents. [195]

2. In mid March 2026, about 3.5 weeks into the Iran War, 88% of Americans were concerned about Iran getting nuclear weapons [196], with 72% concerned about Iran threatening Israel with them. 70% would have liked to see the Iranian government replaced by one that is friendlier to U.S. interests, of which 37% *"somewhat"* and 33% *"extremely or very"*. [197] All of this is counter-balanced with 93% worried about their personal finances in case of war.


Americans prioritize gas prices, Iran's nuclear capacity
Percent of U.S. adults who say when thinking about U.S. foreign policy goals, it is ___ important for the U.S. to...
Extremely or very
Somewhat
Not too or not at all
Don't know
Prevent U.S. oil and gas prices from rising
67%
26%
6%
Prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon
65%
23%
11%
Prevent Iran from threatening Israel
39%
33%
26%
Replace Iran's government with one that's friendlier to U.S. interests
33%
37%
29%
Results are based on interviews with 1,150 U.S. adults conducted Mar. 19-23, 2026. The margin of error is ±4.0 percentage points for the full sample. Don't know responses include those who skipped the question.
Source: The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research
AP

The worries about personal finances in particular went for (immigrant- and poor-dominated) Democrats. A month into the war, *"3 in 10 Republicans said they're "extremely" or "very" worried about affording gas in the next few months, as opposed to about 6 in 10 Democrats."* [198]

In the same poll as above we see that Democrats - more so even than Republicans - really constitute a (black- and immigrant-dominated) cult with zero "in between" thinking:



Despite that, 59% of all American adults weren't all that opposed to the U.S. strikes on Iran:



3. Around the same time, in mid March 2026, another poll showed that 77% of Republicans agreed with some form of military intervention - yet only 12% of Democrats did, with 87% opposing. [199]



4. A poll taken immediately after the initial February 28, 2026 strike on Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, revealed that 59% of Americans disapproved of it, with 41% approving. Only 44% supported overthrowing the regime, with 56% opposed to it. Furthermore, 39%, with another 33% unsure, felt that the U.S. had not engaged in enough diplomacy. 62% of those polled thought that Trump *"should get congressional approval for any further military action."*[200]

   However, looking at political lines, 55% of Republicans *"were supportive of the military action"*, versus just 7% of Democrats. 32% of Republicans and 73% of Democrats opposed. [201]

5. In one early March 2026 poll, 41% of Americans supported the U.S. war, 52% did not, and 7% was not sure. 72% of the those polled were *"non-hispanic white"*. Republicns and Democrats were evenly polled. NBC didn't separate Republican versus Democrat numbers. [202]

6. In another poll at the same time, 79% of Republicans approved of the war. In contrast, 86% of Democrats disapproved. Overall, 44% supported versus 56% opposition. [203]

7. Not very surprising, *"Gen Z is the least likely generation to approve (24%). Millennials were 36%, Gen X 40% and Baby Boomers 39%."*[204]

2025 U.K. polls: 84% opposes Iran nukes, but 44% supports war

Similar to the Democrat Party in the United States, it is important to keep in mind that Labour is the U.K. party that the vast amount of immigrants vote for. [205] About 1 in 5 voters of Labour is (Thrd World) immigrant.

1. The earlier-mentioned 2009 Pew poll showed that relatively few Brits were concerned in 2009 about Iran having nuclear weapons. Just 68%, by far the lowest among western countries polled at the time. [206]

2. During the Israel-Iran War of June 2025, 84% of Britons said that they opposed a nuclear-armed Iran. [207] However, just 44% supported military intervention to prevent this. [208]

2026 U.K. polls: 25% support for U.S. bombings; 44-20% male-female support for U.S. using U.K. bases

1. Early in the 2026 war, in early March, only 26% of Britons polled said that the U.S.-Israel strikes on Iran were going to make a positive difference in preventing Iran from getting nuclear weapons, the majority being ambivalent. Only 15% believed the strikes would result in some kind of positive regime change. [209] In contrast, Britons strongly believed that the war was going to hurt the global economy (77%), the British economy (77%), personal finances (64%), America's reputation (68%), and U.S.-U.K. relations (66%). [210]

2. In the first few days of the war, on March 2, 2026, 49% of Britons opposed the U.S.-Israel war against Iran, with 28% support. [211] 26% of 18 to 22-years-olds supported the war, versus 39% of the largely-retired 65+ population. [212] Nigel Farage's white-dominated Reform Party, followed by the similarly white-dominated Conservatives were the major supporters. Lefties - the Greens in particular - and many immigrants (who vote for Labour en masse) were the biggest opponents. As the strikes continued, support actually went down across the board, to 59% against and 25% in favor [213]:


Opposition to US military action against Iran rises 10pts to 59% in the UK
Do you support or oppose the military action that the United States has taken against Iran? %
2 March
All Britons | 2024 Green | 2024 Labour | 2024 Lib Dem | 2024 Cons. | 2024 Reform
Strongly support 11 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 17 | 36
Somewhat support 17 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 32 | 22
Somewhat oppose 22 | 19 | 26 | 29 | 21 | 17
Strongly oppose 27 | 51 | 37 | 35 | 14 | 8
9 March
All Britons | 2024 Green | 2024 Labour | 2024 Lib Dem | 2024 Cons. | 2024 Reform
Strongly support 10 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 28
Somewhat support 15 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 29 | 29
Somewhat oppose 22 | 23 | 25 | 27 | 26 | 15
Strongly oppose 37 | 64 | 51 | 54 | 17 | 12
YouGov
2 March 2026 • Get the data

3. At the outset of the war, in late February 2026, 58% of Britons opposed American use of RAF bases for strikes on Iran. Men supported 44% versus women just 20%. [214]

4. In contrast, only 21% of the British polled - likely at least half of them Pakistani or other immigrant - said that the U.K. should condemn the U.S. for attacking Iran, indicating most people are uncertain about the immediate threat that Iran poses and mainly are concerned about (much) higher gas and heating prices. [215]

5. When we look deeper, indeed the British public was very confused as to why Trump attacked Iran. 27% considered the reasons clear versus 61% unclear. [216]

Polls summary: everybody worried about a nuclear-armed Iran, but mass "liberal CIA" propaganda stifles military support

Usually polls make sense. Maybe they do here too. A list of explanations as to why support for war against a nuclear-obsessed Iran hasn't been higher:

1. Women - at least in the U.K. - voting against intervention at literally less than half the rates as men might well be one of the biggest arguments for men to strip women of their voting rights when it comes to geopolitical issues.

2. People have no clue as to just how close Iran was getting to nuclear-tipped ICBMs that could reach Europe.

3. They forget that a nuclear Iran will force other Middle Eastern countries to build nuclear weapons, as Saudi Arabia announced [217] and Turkey suggested. [218]

4. People are confused as to the reasons for the Iran war with endless talk of Trump starting it on behalf of the "Israel lobby" and to distract from the Epstein files - while little information is given about Iran's endless nuclear sins.

5. People don't understand the ultra-stubbornness of the Arab (terrorist) mindset, nor are they away just how many decades of diplomacy and sanctions have been going on, without the desired effect.

6. People don't know this, because the liberal-globalist media and its hyper-prominent "liberal CIA" aspect under George Soros haven't been informing them about this. Even in 2026, while condemning or supporting the U.S.-Israel strikes on Iran, politicians too were extremely vague in their wording, lacking any and all details on the countless ways Iran has been circumventing peaceful nuclear protocols.

7. More and more, modern western generations have been brought up indoctrinated to believe that the West is a colonialist evil. This is all "liberal CIA" mass immigration and white guilt propaganda.

8. People are deathly afraid that rising energy and gasoline prices might result in them losing their job, and maybe even their house.

9. People are even more afraid that formal support by the U.S. or U.K. might result in retaliation against these countries specifically, leading to major economic problems. Britain might be extra vulnerable here due to Brexit.

AYATOLLAH IRAN "AXIS OF EVIL"-WORTHY

Low IQ, terrorist, genocidal, unhinged, and suicidal

Looking at Ayatollah Iran, one has to realize that the West, Russia, China, Argentina and other countries have been signing and attempting to sign nuclear deals with a country that:

1. ignoring a number of recent manipulations, seemingly by the Iranian leadership itself, has an average IQ of 80 to 84, which is 20 points lower than white IQ, 30 points lower than the IQ of western Jews, and essentially would require "special needs" education based on western standards;

2. has its military and security services controlled by a permanent Ayatollah theocrat with jihadist proclivities rather than temporary, elected presidents, who are subordinate to the Ayatollah;

3. has a leadership that was only supported by 20% of the population by June 2024, with only 11% supporting the principles of its very strict 1979 Islamic revolution [219];

4. kept getting caught from 2002 on with trying to hide major aspects of its nuclear program;

5. in its relentless pursuit of ICBMs, nuclear bombs and terrorist financing, with all the sanctions and isolation that came with it, has allowed the country to dry out to such an extent that it may need to abandon its 10 million-people capital of Tehran [220];

6. targets the family of anybody within Iran who even remotely is considered a dissident [221];

7. spies on dissidents and critics who fled to the West, and sometimes intimidates [222] or assassinates them there [223];

8. has a habit of publicly executing its top athletes who participated in protests [224];

9. has public executions involving up to 45 minute torture-hangings from cranes, after sham trials that half the time last less than 45 minutes, with testimony obtained under torture, and women having few rights after accusations have been made against them by men. [225];

10. massacres its own population by the tens of thousands if that is what it takes to keep control [226], and then continues to torture, gangrape, and eventually murder tens of thousands of additional imprisoned protestors [227];

11. under the leadership of the Ayatollah, brainwashed its population during the Iran-Iraq War to the point that huge numbers of children "volunteered" or "were volunteered" to sacrifice themselves on the battlefield by running into mine fields and enemy lines, sometimes tied together with ropes or strapped with explosives [228];

12. in general pioneered the use of suicide bombings during the beginning stages of the Iran-Iraq War, with the Iraqi embassy in Beirut bombing of 1981 being the first major one [229];

13. threatens to massacre and purposely targets civilian centers during war [230];

14. fires illegal [231] cluster munition warheads during war, hitting anything from hospitals [232] to random civilians over many miles [233];

15. recruited 12-year-old children as soldiers for its war against the U.S. in 2026; [234];

16. called on *"all young people, athletes, artists, students and university students and their professors"* to form human shields *"around the power plants"* when they were under threat of being bombed, due to the regime being totally and completely uncompromising; [235];

17. in foreign policy operates more as a suicidal terrorist agent of chaos than a country with a rational military strategy, exemplified too by the fact that when the U.S. and Israel attacked in 2026, that Iran quickly launched *"5,000 missile and drone attacks"* [236] at *"Qatar, Iraq, Syria, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman, Jordan, and Kuwait"* [237], including at luxury hotels, airports and seaports [238], *"despite [these countries formally] not being part of the conflict."*[239]

18. used to sent terrorists into neighboring Iraq to fight the Americans, along with Syria;

19. finances the terrorist group Hamas, the murderous regime running Gaza since 2006 that was behind the October 7 attack, and before that, in particular before Israel put up walls with underground sensors, carried out an endless stream of suicide bombings and shootings against civilian Israeli targets such as crowded busses, bus stops, night clubs, and malls;

20. controls the terrorist group Hezbollah, which controls Lebanon and similarly carries out countless attacks against Israeli civilian targets;

21. finances the Houthi rebels in Yemen who fight a guerrilla and terrorist war against Saudi Arabia in particular, a country that has not been a threat to the West in terms of attempting to create weapons of mass destruction; and later also terrorized Red Sea shipping lanes to aid Iran's war on Israel;

22. has more than double the amount of foot soldiers in Iraq than the Iraqi Central Government;

23. had a large number of militias fighting alongside the murderous dictator Bashar Al-Assad against U.S.-backed Free Syrian Armies, and against Israel in general;

24. aided Assad in building a covert plutonium plant to develop nuclear weapons. [240]

IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM TIMELINE

1953-1979: "Atoms for Peace": U.S. and E.U. build nuclear reactors for Pakistani and Iranian dictators, amongst others

1. **Dec. 1953:** U.S. president Dwight Eisenhower announces his 'Atoms for Peace' program to the United Nations, a globalist program centered on a global *"atom bank"* with the idea of supplying nuclear know-how and power to the entire Third World, including Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Pakistan's arch-enemy India, and Israel. While outsiders warn of likely regime changes and the likelihood of weaponization down the line by these countries, Eisenhower promotes his 'Atoms for Peace' with the utopian idea that his program will *"hasten the day when fear of the atom will begin to disappear."*[241]

   For context, this program is uncorked right as people tied to his administration, and the CFR under David Rockefeller, are busy setting up the first Bilderberg conference.

   Maybe not very surprising, David's older brother, Nelson Rockefeller, as an advisor on psychological warfare and other issues to Eisenhower [242], is a major supporter of the program, and certainly plays a key role in devising the overlapping 'Open Skies' program [243], in which the Soviet Union and U.S. would be allowed to fly over each other's countries to inspect potential military buildup. Rockefeller also successfully advises Eisenhower on a reorganization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. [244]

   In fact, the Rockefeller family has been behind just about every U.S. president in the 20th and early 21st century, and their administrations, as proved in ISGP's 'Managed Democracy: U.S.' article. Eisenhower's secretary of state John Foster Dulles and his brother Allen Dulles, Eisenhower's CIA director, grew up with the Rockefellers and can be found in overlapping groups as the Pilgrims Society and the CFR.

2. **June 1955:** Initial "Atoms for Peace" nuclear development deal between the U.S. and Pakistan. [245], one year after "liberal CIA"-oriented USAID already has been funding a French project that involves 15 Pakistani trainees that include Munir Khan, who in the 1970s, under prime minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (whose cousin Mumtaz, also the father of the 2007 assassinated Benazir Bhutto,

was 1001 Club in the 1970s-1980s with the Rockefellers and Rothschilds), would set up Pakistan's eventually successful nuclear bomb project. [246] Pakistan would develop its first nuclear bomb in 1998, 24 years after arch-enemy India.



PAKISTAN AFFAIRS

ISSUED EVERY TWO WEEKS BY THE EMBASSY OF PAKISTAN, WASHINGTON, D. C.

June 24, 1955

U. S. and Pakistan Initial "Atoms-for-Peace" Program

Ambassador Syed Amjad Ali has hailed Pakistan's participation in the "Atoms-for-Peace" program as "a further step in close cooperation between the United States and Pakistan."

Following the ceremonies held in Washington on June 15, during which the Governments of Pakistan and the United States initialed the proposed Agreement for cooperation in research of peaceful uses for atomic energy, Ambassador Amjad Ali said: "The great President of the United States has once again given the lead in utilizing this discovery of the century for peaceful purposes and Pakistan is privileged to be associated with the United States in this 'Atoms-for-Peace' program."

Initialing for the United States were Mr. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Mr. John Jernegan of the State Department.

Under the proposed Agreement Pakistan will receive information on design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use. It is contemplated that private American citizens and organizations would be authorized to supply the Pakistan Government or, authorized individuals under its jurisdiction, with appropriate equipment and services. It provides that the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission will lease to the Pakistan Government up to six kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of twenty per cent U-235.

The Agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the parties that the initial Agreement will lead to the consideration of further cooperation in peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The proposed Agreement will enable Pakistani scientists and engineers to acquire training and experience in peaceful uses of atomic energy, including civilian nuclear power, within the framework of the "Atoms-for-Peace" program.

In 1955, Pakistan, a democracy since British independence in 1947, continually is in political turmoil. A coup by the pro-West General Ayub Khan in 1958 will bring some internal stability, but despite Khan's initial strong U.S.-U.K.-allied anti-communism, he ends up regularly beefing with the West over his need for good relations with the Soviet Union and China, as well as western support for arch-enemy India. In subsequent decades, Pakistan's government would continually switch between civilian leadership and military coups.

Despite all this instability, the U.S. and western countries continue to ship nuclear know-how to Pakistan.

3. **1957:** Founding of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), based on the December 1953 'Atoms for Peace' Eisenhower speech. [247]

4. **1957-1979:** Four years after the brutal Shah of Iran dictator consolidates power in the U.K.-U.S. Iranian coup of 1953 against the overly nationalist Mohammad Mosaddegh, the Eisenhower administration thinks it's a good idea to sign an 'Atoms-for-Peace' deal with the Shah. [248] Until the Islamic Revolution of the Ayatollahs in 1979, presidents JFK, LBJ, Nixon, Ford, whose vice president is Nelson Rockefeller; and Carter all have no issue helping to build nuclear power plants and delivering uranium for "peaceful

purposes". From 1975 on, Siemens is building the Bushehr nuclear reactor. They only stop building the reactor, after the new Ayatollah regime fails to pay.

1979-2000s: Siemens and Germany, Argentina, China, Russia and North Korea aid Ayatollah Iran with nuclear know-how and power plants

1. **1979:** Siemens only stops building the Bushehr reactor, after the new Ayatollah regime fails to pay. [249]

2. **Feb. 1984:** German engineers return to Iran to see if they can finish the Bushehr reactor. [250]

3. **March 1984:** Saddam Hussein's Iraq attacks the Bushehr reactor, preventing it from being finished any time soon. [251]

4. **1985:** China supplies Iran with a nuclear research center and "training reactor" at Isfahan. [252]

5. **1989:** Argentina supplies the old "Atoms for Peace" Tehran Research Reactor with a new core. In 1993 it supplies 50 pounds of uranium for the reactor. [253]

6. **1992-1995:** Iran signs deals with Russia for nuclear cooperation and, in 1995, the building of a light water reactor at Bushehr, under global safeguards set by the IAEA. [254]

7. **1995:** China supplies Iran with a nuclear research center and "training reactor" at Isfahan. [255]

2002-: Iran, with Syria and North Korea, repeatedly caught going rogue with its nuclear program

1. **1989-2003:** Covert uranium research program - known as the "AMAD Plan" - to try and develop nuclear ICBM warheads. This program wasn't really figured out until the mid 2000s. [256]

2. **Aug. 15, 2002:** As Iranian exile group, the National Council of Resistance of Iran, exposes in a Washington, D.C. press conference that Iran is developing a secret uranium enrichment plant and research lab at Natanz, as well as a heavy-water plant at Arak. Soon

after, Iran is forced to admit the existence of these sites and invite the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to inspect them. [257] As heavy-water is mainly suitable for plutonium production, while uranium enrichment also is not something that Iran has much use of for a peaceful program, it raises nothing but suspicions that Iran is working towards plutonium and uranium nuclear warheads. [258]

3. **Feb. 2003:** After a number of delays, immediately before the U.S. invasion of neighboring Iraq, IAEA director general Mohamed ElBaradei finally is allowed to visit the secret Natanz facility. It appears that renewed IAEA insight into Iran's nuclear program, in addition to the occasional Israeli bombing or sabotage, is what prevents the U.S. from invading Iran, sticking to invading and managing Iraq.

4. **Feb. 22, 2004:** Iran admits to have purchased parts for its nuclear program in secret, from international sellers. [259] This too is against IAEA protocol.

5. **June 2005:** The Natanz Enrichment Complex is struck by an Israeli airstrike, destroying and or significantly damaging the centrifuges here.

6. **Jan. 10, 2006:** Iran, under the new reactionary president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, breaks the seals on Natanz, and restarts the uranium enrichment program. [260]

7. **Dec. 2006:** Ibrahim Othman, head of the Atomic Energy Commission of Syria, arrives in London under a pseudonym. Israeli intelligence finds out, follows him, breaks into the laptop left behind in his hotel room, and finds hundreds of pictures of an already suspected secret nuclear site at Al Kibar, Syria, built with help from North Korea and a suspected $1 billion in funding from Iran. [261]

8. **Aug. 2007:** Sayeret Matkal covertly raid the Al Kibar nuclear project, bringing back proof of nuclear materials present at the site.

9. **Sep. 6, 2007:** Israel bombs the Al Kibar nuclear project into oblivion with Operation Outside The Box in September 2006, after the Bush government refused to help, apparently worried that Bashar Assad already had been driven into a tight spot due to a forced withdrawal from Lebanon, and likely out of desperation would choose all-out war if Al Kibar was bombed. Israel did so anyway, and ended up being right that Assad did nothing, as long as the nature of the explosion was kept secret. [262]

10. **2006-2008:** Continuous bickering over Iran's nuclear program, with the United Nations and Bush administration imposing sanctions on the regime.

11. **Sep. 21, 2009:** Iran discloses *"the construction of a new pilot enrichment plant [in Qom] to the IAEA."*[263] However, Iran only does so after finding out Western powers are about to reveal its existence. U.S., British, and French intelligence services have been secretly monitoring this site in Qom since its inception in 2006, describing it as *"a very heavily protected, very heavily disguised facility."* With an estimated capacity of at least 3,000 centrifuges, it is not considered credible to be anything like a "pilot plant". On September 25, the U.S., Great Britain, and France disclose the site's discovery to the world, only months before it is thought to become operational. [264]

12. **2010:** In February Iran announces that it has enriched uranium to 20% and has the ability to enrich it further. By mid 2010 more sanctions from the US, UN, and EU follow.

13. **Dec. 2010:** Iran starts producing its own yellowcake, in order to make its own nuclear fuel. The sale of yellowcake to Iran is prohibited.

14. **2011:** Iran refuses to give transparency about its enrichment project. In May the EU and US impose additional sanctions. In a November 8, 2011 report, *"the IAEA says that Iran is working on all aspects of research toward making a nuclear weapon, including fitting a warhead onto a missile and working on detonators."*[265]
15. **May 2012:** The IAEA reports that is has found traces of uranium enriched to 27% at Fordow, higher than the declared 20%. [266]

16. **Mid-late 2012:** Continuous reports, also by the IAEA, that there's a cover up going on at Iran's Parchin military complex. For years, IAEA researchers have suspected that explosion tests have been done here related to the construction of nuclear weapons, but researchers have always been denied access. Now satellite images show that the site is being heavily remodeled. [267]

17. **2013-2014:** Endless international controversy over Iran's nuclear program, interspaced with new sanctions. For the longest time Iran refuses to talk to the United States, but eventually does so on several occasions with the Obama administration officials.

2015 Obama-Iran nuclear energy deal: advantages

The nuclear energy deal Obama signed with Iran in November 2015 has been very controversial. Obama knew that it would be when he struck it, because he kept key sections of the deal secret. When leaked in July 2016, it revealed that key controls over the Iranian nuclear program would fall away as soon as January 2027. Below the pros and cons of the nuclear deal can be found. We start with the pros.

With the Obama-Iran nuclear energy deal, Iran agreed to:

1. continuous monitoring by the IAEA for 15 years (2030), including live cameras and routine and random inspections;

2. continued monitoring by the IAEA of Iran's centrifuge production for 20 years (2035);

3. continued monitoring by the IAEA of Iran's uranium mines and mills for 25 years (2040);

4. continued monitoring by the IAEA of Iran's nuclear program beyond 25 years (2040) at a more intrusive level than has been the case before the deal;

5. lose 98% of its stockpile of enriched uranium for 15 years (2030), bringing it down from 10,000 kg to no more than 300 kg;

6. enrich uranium to no more than 3.67%, enough for nuclear power but not for nuclear weapons (90%);

7. bring its number of uranium centrifuges (for enrichment) down from 19,000 to 6,100;

    - maintain no more than 5,100 old, inefficient centrifuges at its Natanz facility until, it appears, January 2027;

    - maintain no more than 1,000 (largely inactive) centrifuges at its hardened, underground Fordow facility for 15 years (2030);

8. dismantle its one plutonium reactor and thus curb production of plutonium;

9. not protest that sanctions not related to nuclear power continue to be in place.

To summarize, even though key provisions would start to run out as early as 2027, the nuclear deal allowed the West to have much better insight into the Iranian nuclear program than it had before. And it provided some time to save up for another war.

2015 Obama-Iran nuclear deal: disadvantages

Disadvantages of the Obama-Iran nuclear energy deal with Iran. Iran:

1. is allowed to have a nuclear energy in the first place, meaning that one temporary lapse in western oversight with regard to the usual covert programs of Iran will result in Jihadist Iran having nuclear-tipped ICBMs that can destroy Israel and the West, with barely any way to stop that anymore;

2. can look forward to key aspects of the oversight starting to fall away as soon as 2027 and more in the early 2030s;

3. refused to curb intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) research as part of the deal and immediately exploited this by continuing its tests, the fruits of which we plucked with advanced Iranian ICBM strikes on Israel in 2025 and a number of other countries as well in 2026;

4. insisted on and got 6,000 centrifuges, instead of 500 to 1,500, or 4,000 as a later compromise, suggested by the West;

5. got to keep its remaining 13,000 centrifuges as spares;

6. receives help from Russia as part of the deal that will make its new centrifuges 20 times more effective by the time it is allowed to expand the number of centrifuges [268];

7. can keep using its fortified underground Fordow facility instead of closing it, as was initially demanded;

8. received up to $150 billion in income due to lifted sanctions;

9. was able to deny, harass, follow, intimidate and otherwise obstruct inspectors to a degree, because at least 5 of 8 countries overseeing the deal need to agree that protocol has been broken, which can take up to 24 days to vote on. [269]

2018-: Trump administration withdraws from nuclear deal

In April 2017 Trump removed potential Ayatollah Iran agent Sahar Nowrouzzadeh as head of the State Department's policy council on Iran. [270] Eventually, on May 8, 2018, he had the U.S. withdraw from Obama's

nuclear deal, with sanctions reimposed on Iran in August and November 2018.

2019-2025: Mainly as Trump leaves office, Iran quickly moves from 4% to 60% enrichment; has 11x the enrichment capacity by 2025

Timeline:

1. **April 2019:** Iran already has a batch of experimental batch of 2 to 30 IR-6 centrifuges running. [271] These are 6-10x more efficient than IR-1 ones, the only ones allowed under the 2015 nuclear deal.

2. **June 2019:** Iran breaches its 300kg limit on 3.67% enriched uranium. [272]

3. **Sep. 6, 2019:** Iran gives the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) a one-day notice that it will fully stop cooperating with the Obama nuclear deal. In days and weeks after, it starts installing hundreds of IR-2m and IR-4 uranium centrifuges. [273] These are 3 to 5x more effective than the IR-1 centrifuges, the only ones allowed under the 2015 nuclear deal.

4. **Nov. 14, 2020:** Just one week after Trump loses the 2020 elections, the IAEA records that Iran is in the process of installing additional, more advanced IR-2m uranium centrifuges. [274]

5. **Jan. 2, 2021:** Just over a month after an Israeli assassination of its top nuclear scientist, on November 27, 2020 [275]; and 2.5 weeks before Trump leaves office; Iran announces it will start enriching uranium to 20%. [276]

6. **Feb. 23, 2021:** On this date, Iran *"stopped implementing the Additional Protocol (AP) to its comprehensive safeguards agreement (CSA)."* [277] Effectively Iran went "dark" with its nuclear program on this date, beyond what was already known to inspectors. Declared sites could still be inspected beyond this point. However, with this move, Iran blocked IAEA inspectors from conducting short-notice inspections at undeclared sites. It also stopped giving updates on new nuclear-related locations (thus automatically becoming "undeclared"), manufacturing of centrifuge components, and additional research activities.

7. **April 13, 2021:** In response to an Israeli sabotage action at Natanz on April 11 [278], and with Trump fresh out of office; Iran informs the

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that it will start enriching uranium to 60%. [279]

8. **May 2022:** Iran has installed 538 advanced IR-6 centrifuges, with aims to reach one thousand by December 2022. [280] IR-6 centrifuges are 7-10x more efficient than IR-1 ones, the only ones allowed under the 2015 nuclear deal.

9. **June 2022:** Iran shuts down IAEA surveillance cameras at Natanz, Fordow and other locations after the IAEA *"criticized Iran for not explaining the presence of uranium traces at three sites it had not declared to be part of its nuclear program."* After a lot of criticism, the cameras finally are turned on again in May 2023, but this still resulted in an *"irreversible ... knowledge gap"*. [281]

10. **Feb. 2023:** Two Fordow centrifuge cascades are configured *"substantially different"* than reported, and are generating uranium particles up to a whopping 83.7%. [282] Supposedly it involves a mistake. [283]

11. **Feb. 2024:** Iran is estimated to have *"almost 7400 advanced centrifuges at Natanz and Fordow"*, bringing *"the total number of installed centrifuges to about 14,600."* Iran's *"total operating enrichment capability is estimated to be about 19,800 separative work units (SWU) per year."* [284]

12. **May 2025:** Iran is estimated to now have *"nearly 14,689 advanced [R-2m, IR-4 and IR-6] centrifuges installed at Natanz and Fordow"*, with the *"the total number of installed centrifuges to roughly [be] 21,900. ... Its enriching centrifuge capacity is less [than the 64,000 swu/year installed], approximately 50,000 swu/year."* These numbers indicate that Iran has almost doubled its capacity in advanced centrifuges in the past year, and has more than doubled its enrichment capability over this same period. The enrichment capacity for the 5,060 IR-1 centrifuges under the 2015 Obama deal was 4,554 SWU/year [285], so enrichment capacity has grown at least 11x in the 6 years between 2019 and and the U.S.-Israel bombings of June 2025.

13. **June 2025:** The IAEA reveals that *"a few years ago"* they found out that Iran had been spying on the agency, acquiring confidential IAEA documents on its assessment of the Iranian nuclear program. [286]

Jan. 2025-: Trump back in office, as Iran can produce a nuke *"within days"*

From the timeline in the previous section and a number of quotes here from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Arms Control Association, and the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS), it is clear that there were good reasons for Israel to launch its limited war on Iran in June 2025, ending in Trump's B-2 strike on Iran's Fordow and Natanz underground nuclear bunkers. Everybody agreed that essentially from that moment on, there was a very clear and present danger of Iran quickly enriching its 60% stockpile to 90% weapons grade, convert it to a nuclear bomb, and put it in an unstoppable hypersonic ICBM, before anyone could do something about it:

"The significantly increased production and accumulation of highly enriched [60%] uranium by Iran, the only non-nuclear-weapon State to produce such nuclear material, is of serious concern. ... Iran has neither provided technically credible explanations for the presence of uranium particles of anthropogenic origin at undeclared locations in Iran nor informed the Agency of the current location(s) of the nuclear material and/or of the contaminated equipment involved."

~ Feb. 26, 2025, IAEA Board of Governors briefing document. [287]

"Currently, Iran is enriching uranium to 60 percent at both its large-scale uranium enrichment facility at Natanz and its smaller, underground Fordow facility. Iran has amassed enough material enriched to that level and installed enough centrifuges that has a near-zero breakout (the time necessary to produce enough fissile material for a bomb, or 25 kilograms of uranium enriched to 90 percent). As of late May 2025, Iran could produce enough weapons-grade uranium for one bomb within days, and within weeks, enough for about 8-10 warheads. The IAEA would quickly detect any move by Iran to increase enrichment to weapons-grade levels at its declared sites. But with breakout so short, the international community may not have enough time to respond before Iran could divert the weapons-grade uranium to covert locations and begin the weaponization process."

~ June 12, 2025 Arms Control Association report, which for the rest adhered to the Rockefeller-Soros-type globalist narrative that

> Trump and Netanyahu need to *"abandon"* their *"more extreme demand of zero enrichment."*[288]

"Iran could produce its first quantity of 25 kg of WGU [weapons-grade uranium] in Fordow in as little as two to three days. ... 25 kg of weapon-grade uranium (WGU) per weapon [is plenty]. ...

"Iran has no civilian use or justification for its production of 60 percent enriched uranium, particularly at the level of hundreds of kilograms. Its rush to make much more, quickly depleting its stock of near 20 percent enriched uranium, which has a civilian use in research reactors, raises more questions. Even if one believed the production of 60 percent is to create bargaining leverage in a nuclear negotiation, Iran has gone way beyond what would be needed. One has to conclude that Iran's real intent is to be prepared to produce large quantities of WGU [weapon-grade uranium] as quickly as possible, in as few centrifuges as possible. ...

"Although the IAEA can ascertain the number of centrifuges deployed at Fordow and Natanz, it cannot know how many more Iran has made and stored or deployed at an undeclared site."

> ~ June 9, 2025 Institute for Science and International Security report.[289]

MIDDLE EAST PSYCHOLOGY & CONCLUSIONS

You are not prepared for the mindset

This personal story actually is quite pertinent. First of all, I've seen all neighborhoods I ever lived in get wiped away due to mass immigration - black and Arab immigration in particular. It's not a pretty sight. Sticking to Arabs, there's something very different about them than white people, as race IQ and race crime statistics actually prove. One major difference is just how many live for conflict, including violent conflict. In just one example, in 2023 I heard no less than 6 groups of Moroccans randomly walk past me aggressively and excitedly talking to each other about fighting with fists, knives, and guns. Ironically, I had one Moroccan describe Iranians as *"crazy"* to me.

I could get away from pretty much all these immigrants though. But not always. And again, it wasn't a pretty sight. However, none of this actually properly prepared me for my Iranian neighbor - a store owner - that I had for 6 years. Through him I met two more Iranians: one sold Iranian cookies that always were months over their date. The other liked to smoke pot and blamed the U.S. for everything. Those two were the "nice", "normal" ones - as far as you could have any kind of intellectual conversation with them.

My Iranian neighbor, very different. Hating white people, being unreasonable, okay, that's one thing. But on top of that having absolutely no sense of survival, that's a different one. What I certainly always thought interesting, was that the bombastic behavior of my Iranian neighbor always COMPLETELY and TOTALLY mirrored that of Ayatollah Iran in the news.

There's literally not a single good aspect of his behavior that I could mention, apart maybe from "trying to make it" (sort of) and having an interest in technology (sort of). A description of his general behavior, much of which could be proved if it were necessary:

1. No intellectual capacity, apart from trying to get something from others. After a while you just have to accept that this tunnelvision has to be due him coming from a country where the average IQ is 83, on par with western "special needs" education. I have the same problem in general talking to Third World migrants. More often than not it seems like "somebody isn't home".
2. Extremely radical and emotional, to the point of being completely suicidal in his "eye for an eye approach" - because he was videotaped and otherwise caught by me doing illegal things over a dozen times as a result of "trying to get back at me" (for no good reason, other than setting limits to his behavior).
3. Instead of just being a functional citizen, completely and totally obsessed with "the struggle", seemingly in particular against "the disbelievers".
4. He never-ever-ever lets a conflict or grudge go, even if he is not in the right, no matter the amount of years passed. No matter the suffering it causes him.
5. Very purposely and dramatically ignores any rules set by local governments or local citizens. He simply doesn't accept any authority, at least no white or soft authority.
6. Has no concept of contractual obligations. Everything he wants, simply "belongs" to him, and he will do endless (illegal) effort to try and get it.
7. Obsessed with trying to humiliate anyone who dares to oppose him.
8. Gets huge satisfaction from being obnoxious.
9. Lies about everything.

10. If he has a conflict with one person, he will try to manipulate any "shared contacts" against you with said lies.
11. Comes across as overly nice and cooperative when he wants something from you.
12. Extremely good at playing the poor innocent victim.
13. Literally makes deals with a big smile, only to purposely break them in 2 seconds. Could be a neighbor, the police, or local authorities.
14. Always the first to hire a lawyer and sue someone or something, only to regularly complain about the money it costs him and that it may have been too impulsive. (He once asked me to fix something for him with a faraway store he bought a second-hand car from, because I'm "a Hollander" - but he didn't want to pay me even a portion up front, and nothing if it failed.)
15. Quietly hates white people, always complaining they are "racist".
16. Yet always attempts to manipulate and steal from his own "Muslim brothers" as well in rather extreme ways. He will shamelessly steal or otherwise usurp their gardens or storefront properties - as he does with public property. Or, in another example, he would gather their autographs under false pretenses; then change the text into saying that I threatened to murder him and am a "bad neighbor". Secret audio recordings proved that to be a lie, by the way, but Justice never cared.
17. An extreme need to be seen as smart and "equal" with white people - despite it being hard to find any white person who has as low of an IQ, and is as bone-headed and radical as he is. I certainly have never met a white person that was that completely off his rocker.
18. Until I removed or had him removed 4 times, he tried to sleep in his store all week, literally never going home to his wife and child. Which I thought was odd as well.

The reason I mention him here is threefold:

1. I still need to write a judicial article involving him - also preventing me from being too specific.

2. I'm trying to illustrate how unprepared polite western people are in understanding the mindset of far too many Middle Eastern people - a mindset you also continually saw with the Iranian regime during the war with the U.S. and Israel.

3. As this article is being written, you see all the same frustrations and behaviorisms pop up, once again:

    - I watch President Trump bombing the Iranians into oblivion, killing almost all top leadership, and then wondering when this *"strange"* Iranian leadership is finally going to surrender. [290]

They don't. A week later Trump is complaining to the Iranians to *"open the fucking Strait, you crazy bastards!"*[291]

- Meanwhile, an already obliterated Iran keeps firing missiles to half a dozen Arab countries, keeps grandstanding with its state TV talking about carrying *"out a coastal military plan to seize parts of the UAE and Bahrain in response to US attacks"* [292], and effectively pisses off just about every country and company on planet Earth by blocking the Gulf of Hormuz. Whenever a peace deal is being made about safe transit through the Gulf of Hormuz, with pressure from China, Iran breaks it immediately by halting shipping again. In between they keep demanding full control over the Straight, knowing full well that none of their leadership might survive.

Whenever I see these developments, I either have to role my eyes or chuckle. Why? Because I've been there. For 6 years. In fact, the worst thing you could possibly do is show that they are getting to you, or are successful in any way in annoying you. That will lead to things rapidly growing out of control. Assuming the parallels continue, the Iranians will never give up. They always keep grandstanding. And they break, or try to circumvent, any deal you make with them, in 2 seconds, with huge glee. This lack of self-preservation is so strange to behold, but I'm totally used to it - due to my Iranian neigbor.

Ironically, the "moderate" Iranian U.N. ambassador (2002-2006) and foreign minister (2013-2021), Javad Zarif, of the old Rockefeller-Soros-tied Iran Project, inadvertently seems to have hit the nail on the head with the Iranian mindset of endless war:

> *"Although continuing to fight the United States and Israel might be* ***psychologically satisfying****, it will lead only to the further destruction of civilian lives and infrastructure."*[293]

What kind of advice is that? That's literally saying, *"Stop being babies."* Imagine having to give this advice to any white commander in history? Or even a Far East Asian one? It would make no sense. It would all be about innate beliefs, about pragmatic issues, or, in the Far East, about "honor". Not about being annoying pricks, while you get your entire society destroyed.

In any case, this is the third time I've seen the Arab (terrorist) mindset properly described. The other two ties were with Israelis, but unfortunately I didn't back them up. One involved a Northern Command general warning a defense minister around 1980 that - paraphrase - *"negotiations will only be taken as weakness by the Arabs, and lead to the situation growing out of control."* Reading it, it shocked me, because the last time I had police knocking on my door was when I explained to

them that my Iranian neighbor interprets any *"reasonableness as weakness"* and that by trying to reason with him, instead of fining him, they are only making it worse for themselves and me - because he knows they can't touch him. The female police officer looked at her male colleague with big eyes, like the quarter had just dropped, repeated the sentence, *"Reasonableness is weakness? "Reasonableness is WEAKNESS?!"* And that's the last time they bothered showing up to my neighbors endless pleas for "help". I honestly thought I was the first one to word it like that, but I was wrong.

The Israelis seem to have understood the Arab mentality for a long time. Another quote I lost was of an Israeli saying that - paraphrase - *"Arabs prefers temporary emotional satisfaction"* (i.e., quickly getting back at Israelis with violence) over more pragmatic solutions. While obviously not applicable to all Arabs, over the whole I personally couldn't agree more. And it strongly ties in with race IQ: the lower the IQ the harder it is to control emotional impulses or oversee the consequences of one's actions.

So as said, I've been there. No matter how many times - in self-defense - I outsmarted, judicially caught, humiliated, [xxxxxxxx], and eventually knocked my Iranian neighbor down... the next day he would ALWAYS be ready for "battle". ALWAYS! Even after [xxxxxx] hundreds of times - with me wanting nothing from him apart from following basic social rules, so I could work on ISGP in peace.

As I said, I can't go into (rather crucial) detail at the moment as to just how extreme this person was with "not listening". And let's not.

In another parallel with the political world, Dutch Justice kept protecting this neighbor of mine in ways that you wouldn't believe. It would be a massive scandal all by itself if it all ended up in the media. Police concluding he perpetrated anything from "attempted aggravated assault" to "attempted manslaughter" - yet the prosecutor's office wouldn't even question him. And that's just where it starts.

The Mongol / Shighren solution

If just a handful of faraway countries want to control a fundamentalist, nuclear-obsessed, Hamas and Hezbollah-allied regime like Ayatollah Iran, it's likely going to be bloody down the line, be it in 2026 or 2066. You are going to need some really major technological discrepancy to solve things relatively peacefully and cost effectively.

Without a really major technological advantage, I personally think not even a 13th century Mongol horde would be able to disarm Iran in a cost-

effective manner without engaging in a massive genocide. The Ayatollah regime would only feign submission, break deals, find work-arounds, resort to terrorist sneak attacks, and continue to choke international trade. And in case of a Mongol horde - or an Alexander the Great, Roman Army, or any historical army really - that's not going to fly. So likely it would result in the same thing that happened at Nishapur and Merv in Iran, both in 1221 [294], or at at Baghdad in 1258, after rulers of the city kept mocking the Mongols: swift, total or near total eliminations of societies.

In that sense, the Shighren too will know how to deal with Ayatollah Iran. Quick and very permanently, and we will have plenty of space to expand our own society on top of the bones. Fortunately or unfortunately, the Shighren themselves forbid such action by humans, lest you want to keep your soul. And wouldn't it be a fascinating irony if that type of do-good humanity leads to Iran nuking half the world a few decades from now?

How extra of a mindbender it would be if it turned out that one initial massacre would have gotten everybody in the country to flee? So the entire nuclear and ICBM programs could have been dismantled in relative peace? Are there historical precedents in which an initial limited genocide prevented more long-term bloodshed? I can come up with several potential candidates, such as in 1948 word spreading of the Deir Yassin massacre, followed by the Nakba (750,000 to 1 million Arab Palestinians fleeing Israel); but this is more about touching on philosophies regarding the prevention of global nuclear annihilation. Intent counts. Butchering a city by hand might cause less deaths than an entire precision-bombing strike and months and years of tussle, and in the end may be much more effective, but does that make it acceptable? Hard to say. Much of it probably comes down to innate motivations.

In any case, I guess we're going to have to look for another way, despite the entire Ayatollah mindset of international Islamic terrorism-sponsoring - supported by countless millions - arguably deserving and needing to be removed from the 21st century as a whole, more so even than ISIS, due to the weapons of mass destruction threat. A few warnings, and then the horde comes in.

Only peace through global alliances and strength

So... if you want to control a fundamentalist, nuclear-obsessed, Hamas and Hezbollah-allied regime like Ayatollah Iran - AND have to resort to the least amount of casualties - one would think that it is crucial that NATO, the EU, Sunni countries, and ideally China and Russia stand together in pressuring Iran to abandon all of its enrichment, ICBM development, and terrorist activities. And not take no for an answer.

Because there really isn't any benefit to anyone to have Iran develop nuclear weapons.

Such operations should already have happened in 2002 when Iran was caught building secret nuclear sites at Natanz and Arak [295], and the U.S. steamrolled over neighboring Iraq months later. All nuclear know-how should have been taken out of Iran, a country with large oil reserves that on top of that can much better thrive on solar power compared to more northern countries.

My suggested strategy towards Iran (and many other Second World and Third World regimes) for many years prior to the 2025 and 2026 wars would be along the lines below:

1. Never show they are annoying or worrying you. Don't mock them either.
2. No negotiations. Only dictations. Compromise will always be taken as weakness, and be exploited.
3. Maximum pressure is required, all the time. Force them into signing deals, and even then keep maximum, non-compromising pressure on.

If it comes to war:

1. Level all air defenses, navy, ICBMs, key nuclear infrastructure.
2. Neutralize all primary and secondary experts, plus students and university programs, with regard to nuclear energy, ICBMs, air force, and navy.
3. Maintain a no-fly zone.
4. Make sure that none of the leadership dares to come above ground for as long as they continue to resist.
5. Maybe drop large amounts of low-quality rifles that fall apart after a few hundred rounds - just enough to start a civil war, but not flood international black markets with weapons.
6. Any invasion, apart from destroying the nuclear program, needs to be focused on dragging out gold, oil, minerals, or other wealth.
7. Alternately, you could threaten severe sanctions, until the country in question has paid back all war debts.
8. Beyond paying back war debts, maybe share the country's resources equally or close to equal with major powers to prevent them from funding your opposition.
9. Bring in a pro-western regime. Democracy is not a must in Third World countries with low IQ. It will most likely lead to high crime and instability without strong authority.
10. For long-term peacekeeping, permanently occupy all Iranian islands and shorelines at the Gulf of Hormuz - ideally by an international

United Nations-backed force. Also occupy Kharg island, where 90% of Iran's oil flows through. [296]

If the West is unified, and working with allied Arab countries (who, as discussed, are very much open to it [297]) and even China and Russia, none of this would be all that hard or costly to arrange. But the globalist movement, and most notably the increasingly powerful "liberal CIA" wing of the globalist movement surrounding Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Foundation, and George and Alex Soros, clearly are preventing this.

On top of that, with their covert long-standing ties to the Iranian regime and endless anti-white and anti-Jewish activist financing - together with their influence on the EU and UN - one may want to be prepared for the ultimate conclusion that these elements prefer Iran to nuke both Israel and the West, for example in order to more permanently shift power from the G7 to their beloved G20. [298] For the same reason they might just be fine arming the Third World with nuclear weapons.

This agenda makes no sense from a traditional point-of-view, but it does fit all the facts. And it also happens to fit a very large portion of my personal Godlike Dreams.

So, in conclusion, I agree with U.S.-Israel war against Iran, as long as it halts nuclear and ICBM development for many years, preferably permanently. This stands in stark contrast to the decades-long war in Afghanistan, with me under all circumstances considering the Ayatollah regime a bigger threat than Saddam Hussein in neighboring Iraq was. Certainly with regard to Iran, there was no need to fabricate evidence to make the case it was working towards nuclear weapons.

It is sad that any major U.S.-Israeli intervention had to wait until the Iranian leadership butchered, tortured and gang-raped tens of thousands of its own protesting citizens [299], which, due to its perfect timing and loud encouragements by the son of the CIA/Mossad-backed Shah of Iran [300] (who must have known a slaughter would happen), unlikely was a total coincidence. But at least this massacre allows us to see just how anti-Jew and anti-white the globalist structures - and in particular the "liberal CIA" ones - are that are dominating the West - because they couldn't have been more dismissive of that "little" domestic genocide. [301] Similarly, it is very clear that the dominant liberal-globalist media is allied in attacking Trump and Israel, while shielding Iran from as much criticism as possible. It's very twilighty.

Future problems: Middle Eastern countries receiving nuclear power; Japan enough plutonium for 5,500 warheads

As discussed, an Iran with nuclear weapons will force other Middle Eastern countries to build nuclear weapons as well, as Saudi Arabia announced [302] and Turkey suggested. [303] The thing is, through South Korean expertise, the United Arab Emirates already has a working nuclear program since 2017. Turkey will have its first nuclear power plant, built by Russia, online in 2026-2027. Saudi Arabia also has been initiating plans to build its first nuclear power plants, also mainly through South Korean expertise.

While, for now, the UAE's program is very transparent, with so many nuclear programs being set up in the Arab world, especially with dwindling power of the West, it likely is only is a matter of time before the nuclear race here goes out of hand.

It's highly likely that in the near future too, due to Chinese aggression, Japan will convert its giant stock of 45 tons of plutonium into nuclear weapons. That is enough plutonium to make 5,500 nuclear warheads, slightly more even than Russia's arsenal at present. [304] It's more natural to have for Japan due to the Far East's genetically high IQ (in contrast to the Middle East), and it being under massive threat from China and North Korea.

It probably only is a matter of time before someone is going to get nuked. I personally think receiving a nuke on my head from China or Japan is less of an abomination than one from a low IQ, radical, Islamic regime - but to each their own.

Notes

1. June 12, 2025, Arms Control Association, 'Zero Enrichment: An Unnecessary, Unrealistic Objective to Prevent an Iranian Bomb'.
2. June 9, 2025, isis-online.org, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — May 2025'.
3. Feb. 26, 2025, IAEA Board of Governors briefing document, 'NPT Safeguards Agreement with the Islamic Republic of Iran', p. 9.
4. Dec. 6, 2024, IranIntl.com, 'US intelligence says Iran could quickly build nuclear weapons'.
5. Aug. 10, 2024, fdd.org (Fdn.for the Defense of Democracies), 'U.S. Intelligence Assessment Drops Claim That Iran 'Not Currently Undertaking' Nuclear Weapons Development'.
6. *) June 20, 2025, Cato Institute (cato.org), 'Americans Don't Want Another War in the Middle East'.
7. March 19, 2026, Reuters, 'Americans think Trump will send ground troops to Iran and don't support it, Reuters/Ipsos poll finds'.

8. April 13, 2021, Al Jazeera, 'Iran to enrich uranium to 60 percent, highest level yet'.
9. armscontrol.org/factsheets/status-irans-nuclear-program-1 (accessed: March 29, 2026): *"Enriching uranium to no more than 3.67 percent, a level suitable for nuclear power reactors, until 2031."*
10. June 9, 2025, isis-online.org, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — May 2025': *"Iran has no civilian use or justification for its production of 60 percent enriched uranium, particularly at the level of hundreds of kilograms. Its rush to make much more, quickly depleting its stock of near 20 percent enriched uranium, which has a civilian use in research reactors, raises more questions. Even if one believed the production of 60 percent is to create bargaining leverage in a nuclear negotiation, Iran has gone way beyond what would be needed. One has to conclude that Iran's real intent is to be prepared to produce large quantities of WGU [weapon-grade uranium] as quickly as possible, in as few centrifuges as possible."*
11. May 25, 2012, NPR, 'U.N. Nuclear Watchdog Finds Traces Of More Highly Enriched Uranium In Iran'.
12. June 12, 2025, Arms Control Association, 'Zero Enrichment: An Unnecessary, Unrealistic Objective to Prevent an Iranian Bomb'.
13. June 9, 2025, isis-online.org, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — May 2025'.
14. June 9, 2025, isis-online.org, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — May 2025'.
15. April 13, 2021, Al Jazeera, 'Iran to enrich uranium to 60 percent, highest level yet'.
16. Feb. 23, 2022, JINSA.org, 'Iran's Short Breakout Time Under JCPOA 2.0.
17. Aug. 10, 2024, fdd.org (Fdn.for the Defense of Democracies), 'U.S. Intelligence Assessment Drops Claim That Iran ‘Not Currently Undertaking’ Nuclear Weapons Development'.
18. Dec. 6, 2024, IranIntl.com, 'US intelligence says Iran could quickly build nuclear weapons'.
19. armscontrol.org/research-reports/2014-06/section-1-background-status-irans-nuclear-program (accessed: April 9, 2026; Arms Control Association).
20. nti.org/education-center/facilities/natanz-enrichment-complex/ (accessed: March 21, 2026; Updated/last reviewed Jun 25, 2025; Nuclear Threat Initiative).
21. Ibid.
22. Aug. 17, 2021, United States Institute for Peace, 'Timeline of Iran's Nuclear Activities'. iranprimer.usip.org/resource/timeline-irans-nuclear-activities (accessed: March 20, 2026).

23. Dec. 30, 2016, ynetnews.com, 'Ex-CIA director: I was sure if we didn't strike Syria's nuclear reactor, Israel would'.
24. Sep. 26, 2009, The Guardian, 'Why Iran confessed to secret nuclear site built inside mountain; At first it was one of many suspicious sites but forensic gathering of intelligence by the west eventually forced Iran to come clean'.
25. Nov. 8, 2011, Federation of American Scientists (FAS), 'IAEA Releases New Report on Iran's Nuclear Program'.
26. May 25, 2012, NPR, 'U.N. Nuclear Watchdog Finds Traces Of More Highly Enriched Uranium In Iran'.
27. June 20, 2012, Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS-online.org), 'Suspected Clean-Up Activity Continues at Parchin Military Complex'.
28. March 29, 2026, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 'Analysis: Iran likely transferred highly enriched uranium to Isfahan before the June strikes'.
29. Feb. 28, 2023, PBS, 'UN report says uranium particles enriched up to 83.7 percent found in Iran'.
30. March 7, 2023, Nuclear Engineering Magazine (NEImagazine), 'Grossi sees positive results from Iran trip'.
31. June 9, 2025, Reuters, 'Iran obtaining IAEA documents is 'bad', shows poor cooperation, Grossi says'.
32. Jan. 22, 2025, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 'How quickly could Iran build its first nuclear weapon? Look at China'.
33. Ibid.
34. Dec. 30, 2016, ynetnews.com, 'Ex-CIA director: I was sure if we didn't strike Syria's nuclear reactor, Israel would'.
35. Oct. 24, 2023, Slate, 'How George W. Bush Helped Hamas Come to Power': *"Bush ... assumed that democracy was the natural state of humanity. ... Fatah and Israel were against holding the elections; Hamas and President Bush were in favor."*
36. June 2025, Euro-Atlantic Resilience Center (Bucharest, Romania), 'Iran and the Dirty Bomb: A Test of Cognitive and Societal Resilience'.
37. March 15, 2026, Telegraaf, 'Van Iran tot Cuba, Oekraïne en Venezuela; de rode draad van Amerika's agressieve buitenlandbeleid leidt steeds naar één en hetzelfde land' ('From Iran to Cuba, Ukraine, and Venezuela; the common thread of America's aggressive foreign policy always leads to one and the same country.').
38. March 27, 2026, Fox News, 'Watchdog blasts BBC, CNN, NYT for applying 'war crime' label almost exclusively to US, Israel in Iran conflict; CAMERA reviewed BBC, CNN, NBC News, The New York Times and Washington Post and found zero uses of the term directed solely at Iran'.

39. Oct. 10, 2018, Investors.com, 'Media Trump Hatred Shows In 92% Negative Coverage Of His Presidency: Study'.
40. March 27, 2026, Reuters, 'Gulf states tell US ending the war is not enough, Iran's capabilities must be degraded': *"Citing 5,000 missile and drone attacks on Gulf energy facilities, civilian infrastructure and maritime traffic, GCC Secretary-General Jasem Al-Budaiwi has said that Iran has "crossed all limits"."*
41. facebook.com/euronews/videos/canadian-prime-minister-mark-carney-on-wednesday-said-that-us-israeli-strikes-on/1701635974156531/ (accessed: March 28, 2026).
42. Jan. 3, 2026, New Delhi Television Ltd (NDTV), '"Legitimate": Italy PM Giorgia Meloni On US Military Action In Venezuela'.
43. youtube.com/watch?v=P9yaMZp-wvI
44. Ibid.
45. June 22, 2025, AP, 'Spain reaches deal with NATO ahead of summit to be excluded from 5% defense spending goal'.
46. Jan. 27, 2026, AP, 'Spain approves decree to regularise half a million undocumented migrants This article is more than 2 months old; Move ... runs counter to anti-migration policies across Europe '.
47. March 19, 2026 YouTube upload by 'Times Now World', 'WATCH: 'This War Is Illegal', Spanish PM Sánchez Slams US-Israel Action in Iran'.
48. March 25, 2026, Times of Israel, 'Spanish PM says Israel wants to inflict ‘same destruction’ on Lebanon as it did on Gaza'.
49. March 27, 2026, Reuters, 'Gulf states tell US ending the war is not enough, Iran's capabilities must be degraded'.
50. March 30, 2026, Al Jazeera, 'WATCH: 'Spain closes airspace to US planes involved in war on Iran'.
51. youtube.com/shorts/74BkLYmxHZ8.
52. youtube.com/shorts/zsq6JlTmF28.
53. March 20, 2026, Politico, 'UK allows US to use bases to bomb Iranian sites targeting ships in Strait of Hormuz; Ministers agreed Friday that permissible actions include degrading missile sites being used by Tehran to attack ships in the Strait.'.
54. ecfr.eu/council (accessed: March 4, 2016): *"Estonia: ... Kaja Kallas ... George Soros (Hungary/USA)..."*
55. ecfr.eu/council (accessed: Sep. 8, 2024; Kallas gone by Dec., with her new EU job): *"Estonia: ... Kaja Kallas – Prime Minister of Estonia; former Member of the European Parliament ... Alexander Soros (Hungary/USA) ... George Soros (Hungary/USA)..."*
56. March 17, 2026, DRM News, 'JUST IN: EU's Kaja Kallas Says “This Is Not Europe’s War,” Rejects EU Role in Strait of Hormuz |AC1B'.
57. March 18, 2026, 'Times Now World' YouTube upload, 'WATCH: ‘This Is NOT Europe’s War,' Kaja Kallas Drops Bombshell; EU Betrays USA? | Times Now World' (long video of Kallas).
58. Ibid.

59. Ibid.: *"Diplomacy is the only way out. ... I'm calling all my ministers, "Let's have a unified position." [So] we are all aligned that this war has got to stop, because it has too high costs for everybody in the world. ...*
On the digital blackout in Iran... We are supporting the civil society... we had this discussion ... on how to provide the internet also to Iran [because] the access to information is an issue. ...
On Palestine... The new war in the Middle East has really shifted the attention away... We discussed this yesterday with the foreign ministers. I again made this push for the sanctions on violent [Jewish] settlers... This is illustrating the problems that we have with the common foreign policy that everybody needs to agree to: 26 agree. 1 doesn't. [So] we can't push this through [and] the Phase 2 is completely stalled. ... Our concern is that still the Board of Peace, that is how it was stated in the United Nations Security Council resolution, was to have a clear role for the Palestinians. ... We have supported the ICC [International Criminal Court] through direct funding. We are also contributing financially to strengthen the office of the prosecutor on the sanctions...
Normalizing the relations with Russia: my question is always, what has changed in this regard? ... If [the Russians] think that they can just agree with the United States on issues that concern Europe and whatever the U.S. [Trump] is telling us we should do, then let's give a very clear signal that this is not the case. You need to talk to us about the issues that concern us."
60. April 13, 2026, Politico, 'Von der Leyen uses Orbán defeat to push for end of veto in EU foreign policy'.
61. Nov. 5, 2025, BBC, 'Pope Leo offers his strongest criticism of Trump yet'.
62. Sep. 17, 2025, America Magazine, 'Pope Leo expresses his ‘profound closeness’ to the people of Gaza as Israeli ground invasion begins'.
63. Dec. 25, 2025, CNN, ' In first Christmas message, Pope Leo decries Palestinians in Gaza being forced to shelter in tents from ‘rain, wind and cold''.
64. March 1, 2026, AOL, 'US-born Pope Leo XIV condemns Iran strikes and calls for ‘reasonable, sincere and responsible dialogue''.
65. March 29, 2026, People, 'Pope Leo Takes Aim at World Leaders as Iran War Continues: God ‘Does Not Listen to the Prayers of Those Who Wage War''.
66. Ibid.
67. March 19, 2026, DRM News YoutUbe upload, '"This Is Not Our War," Dutch PM Rob Jetten Rejects Any Involvement in Iran Conflict | AC1B' (full video of a Jetten interview at the EU).
68. Ibid.
69. youtube.com/shorts/oISvqXOvLDM.

70. youtube.com/watch?v=Jtug-kT4X8s.
71. youtube.com/shorts/74BkLYmxHZ8.
72. March 4, 2026, Yahoo News, 'Carney says he supports Iran strikes 'with regret''.
73. March 3, 2026 YouTube upload by 'LiveNOW from FOX', 'Trump meets German Chancellor, takes questions on Iran war operations'.
74. Ibid., 4:10.
75. March 16, 2026, ABC Australia, 'Germany says Iran war 'not a matter for NATO', as Trump demands Strait of Hormuz help'.
76. March 20, 2026, Times of Israel, 'European leaders call to cease all strikes on energy, water facilities in Middle East; EU foreign policy chief says ‘no appetite’ to get involved in the war, as countries suggest they’ll only intervene in Strait of Hormuz after fighting ceases'.
77. April 28, 2026, CBNC, 'U.S. is ‘being humiliated by Iran,’ says Germany’s Merz, as Europe’s patience wanes' (words of Friedrich Merz): *"The Iranians are obviously very skilled at negotiating, or rather, very skillful at not negotiating, letting the Americans travel to Islamabad and then leave again without any result," Chancellor Friedrich Merz said on Monday. “An entire nation is being humiliated by the Iranian leadership, especially by these so-called Revolutionary Guards. And so I hope that this ends as quickly as possible. ... We have offered, also as Europeans, to send German minesweepers to clear the strait, which has obviously been mined in part. [It's costing Germany] a lot of money, a lot of taxpayers' money and a lot of economic strength."*
78. May 1, 2026, Reuters, 'US withdrawing 5,000 troops from Germany, US officials say'.
79. Nov. 9, 2007, auswaertiges-amt.de, 'Welcome address by Federal Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier at the Grand Launch of the European Council on Foreign Relations Berlin, 9 November 2007': *"I encounter interest in Europe as, to summarize George Soros, the embodiment of an open society..."*.
80. *) April 4, 2017, Reuters, 'Hungary passes law targeting Soros-founded university, thousands protest': *"German President Frank-Walter Steinmeier urged the European Parliament on Tuesday to defend human rights, specifically citing CEU. "Europe should not remain silent, if civil society, even science - we are seeing now at the Central European University in Budapest - is being stifled," Steinmeier said."*

    *) instagram.com/reel/DGSuaOVu9kp/ (Feb. 20, 2025 post): *"ecfr.eu: ... At #MSC2025, German President Frank-Walter Steinmeier quoted ECFR's latest poll, urging Europe to step up and act with confidence. This comes at a critical moment: - As ... fears grew that Trump could strike a deal with Moscow—without Ukraine or Europe in the room."*

81. en.irna.ir/news/81930366/Iran-delegation-meets-political-leaders-in-Davos (Islamic Republic News Agency, in Iran, down during the U.S.-Israel war with Iran on March 27, 2026; the cited text is from Google cache; no date could be figured out): *"The meeting on the sidelines of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland was held after a meeting with the German Foreign Minister Frank Walter Steinmeier [so 2005-2009 or 2013-Jan. 2017]."*
82. rbf.org/about/our-history/timeline/iran-project (accessed: April 5, 2026; Rockefeller Brothers Fund): *"Secretary of State John Kerry, with counterparts Philip Hammond (UK), Laurent Fabius (France), Frank-Walter Steinmeier (Germany) and Vice President of the European Commission Federica Mogherini in March 2015 [during the Iran nuclear deal negotiations]. Photo courtesy of the UK Foreign Office."*
83. Ibid.
84. March 9, 2026 YouTube 'Sky News', 'Ursula von der Leyen delivers speech on Iran war'.
85. March 9, 2026 YouTube 'Sky News', 'Ursula von der Leyen delivers speech on Iran war'.(All top comments and then some are propagandist pro-Iran, anti-Israel, and anti-U.S., as most of Youtube and social media): *"**74 likes:** "Why on earth are we as Europeans not distancing ourselves from the completely unhinged, corrupt, crazy people like those in the American and Israeli governments. They are clearly people who don't care about the rule of law or human life in their persuit for power and economic control. They have proven again and again that they cannot be trusted, yet we keep calling them our allies. We do not share values."*

    ***70 likes:** "No words on the murdered 160 girls! EU no words!"*

    ***52 likes:** "Stop parroting the US. If Iran is a terrorist state, what are US and Israel? The difference is semantics."*

    ***52 likes:** "Get a spine EU!! After being insulted by Donnie orange Trump never send even a bullet to USA !!! Don't follow blindly! Eu must insist the rule of law to stay relevant in the democratic world!!! Be the new leader!!!"*

    ***39 likes:** "No war."*

    ***35 likes:** "Biggest nuclear powered country a demented president and netanyahu both criminals dictating what every other country should do ???"*

    ***27 likes:** "Iran may be, as Von Der Leyen says, a bad cruel dictatorial regime that violates human values but Israel and flattery induced Trump are even worse. Jointly they have foisted upon the world destruction and genocide only wicked evil men can do."*

    ***26 likes:** "If Iran is all that, then what is Israel, what is the U.S and its endless wars? E.U can not break free from Hypocrisy. Iran has a right for self defense."*

12 likes: "Why doesn't she say US and Israel started an illegal war and find a way to stop them?""

86. ecfr.eu/council/members/ (accessed: March 24, 2026): *"Nathalie Loiseau – Member of the European Parliament."*
87. March 10, 2026, Euronews.com, 'Von der Leyen 'acting outside of competence' on Iran war, former France ambassador Araud says'.
88. March 10, 2026, Euronews.com, 'Von der Leyen 'acting outside of competence' on Iran war, former France ambassador Araud says'.
89. ecfr.eu/council/members/ (accessed: March 24, 2026): *"Josep Borrell – Former High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission."*
90. March 11, 2026, El Pais, 'Iran war deepens EU's internal divisions following Von der Leyen's world order remarks'.
91. January 3, 2026, Al Jazeera, 'World reacts to US bombing of Venezuela, 'capture' of Maduro': *"Jean-Noel Barrot said the US operation in Venezuela undermined international law. "The military operation that led to the capture of Nicolas Maduro violates the principle of not resorting to force, that underpins international law. France reiterates that no lasting political solution can be imposed from the outside and that only sovereign people themselves can decide their future," he wrote on X."*
92. March 11, 2026, El Pais, 'Iran war deepens EU's internal divisions following Von der Leyen's world order remarks'.
93. March 11, 2026, El Pais, 'Iran war deepens EU's internal divisions following Von der Leyen's world order remarks'.
94. facebook.com/euronews/videos/canadian-prime-minister-mark-carney-on-wednesday-said-that-us-israeli-strikes-on/1701635974156531/ (accessed: March 28, 2026).
95. legal.un.org/repertory/art2.shtml (accessed: March 28, 2026).
96. legal.un.org/repertory/art51.shtml (accessed: March 28, 2026).
97. x.com/kajakallas/status/ 2007405051896123707 (Jan. 3, 2026 tweet).
98. x.com/jnbarrot/status/ 2007463353631809684 (Jan. 3, 2026 tweet).
99. Jan. 3, 2026, Al Jazeera, 'World reacts to US bombing of Venezuela, 'capture' of Maduro'.
100. Ibid.
101. Jan. 5, 2026, asianews.network, 'UNSC to meet amid alarm over US action in Venezuela, concerns about risks to international system'.
102. Jan. 3, 2026, Al Jazeera, 'World reacts to US bombing of Venezuela, 'capture' of Maduro'.
103. justia.com/international-law/use-of-force-under-international-law/ (accessed: March 30, 2026): *"When a state faces an imminent attack, it may have a right to act in anticipatory self-defense. Article 51 and other provisions of the UN Charter do not address this situation. However, customary international law recognizes the right of anticipatory self-defense when an armed attack is imminent*

and inevitable. [But] if an attack is possible but not imminent, a state probably cannot launch a pre-emptive strike."

104. avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br-1842d.asp (accessed: March 30, 2026)
105. 'Aggression and World Order: A Critique of United Nations Theories of Aggression'. By Julius Stone. [Review by:] Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958. Pp. xiv, 226.
106. Oct. 26, 1984, New York Times, 'Excerpts From Shultz's Address on International Terrorism'.
107. June 7, 2002, The Guardian, 'The Bush doctrine makes nonsense of the UN charter'.
108. Ibid.
109. Ibid. The Guardian is financed by the Rockefeller and Ford foundations.
110. March 2, 2026, Jerusalem Post, 'It's about ballistic missiles stupid, not nukes - and regime change is a plus - analysis': *"After June 2025, Iran raced forward and brought its ballistic missile program back from around 1,300 missiles to around 2,500 missiles [trying to get] to 4,000, 6,000, or even 8,000 – numbers that could overwhelm Israel's air defense shield. This was an existential threat. To date, Israel has destroyed 150 ballistic missiles and a number of sites. That is not enough."*.
111. Nov. 21, 1971, New York Times, 'The Council on Foreign Relations—Is It a Club? Seminar? Presidium? 'Invisible Government'?'.
112. Oct. 3, 2004, Angieon911.com (site of a nutty anti-NEW right-winger), 'David Ray Griffin Responds & So Do I' (copy-paste of a Sep. 13, 2004 email of David Ray Griffin)'.
113. Feb. 16, 1979, Richard Falk for the New York Times, 'Trusting Khomeini'. According to ISGP's old notes from around 2007, the original article also read: *"Editor's note: Richard Falk ... recently visited the Ayatollah Khomeini in France."* In the article itself, Falk only wrote: *"Ayatollah Khomeini said recently, in France..."*
114. mepc.org/about/whoswho/natadv.html (accessed: May 12, 2001): *"National Advisory Committee: ... Dr. Richard Falk, Professor of International Law and Practice, Princeton Center for International Studies. ... Mr. Gary G. Sick, Adjunct Professor of International Affairs, Columbia University."*
115. mepc.org/about-council/our-leadership/national-advisory-committee (accessed: January 8, 2015): *"Dr. Richard Falk Professor of International Law and Practice, Princeton Center for International Studies..."*
116. March 11, 2009, Al Jazeera, 'US diplomat resigns from intelligence post over Israel criticism': *"Chas Freeman, a former US ambassador to Saudi Arabia, withdrew before starting work as chairman of the national intelligence council, accusing his critics of libel, character*

assassination and "utter disregard for the truth". The "Israel Lobby", he argued, was stifling any discussion of US policy options in the Middle East except those endorsed by "the ruling faction in Israeli politics..."".

117. american-iranian.org/Pages/AboutAIC /Leadership/LShipMain.html (accessed: Jan. 10, 2002): *"Advisory Council: ... Richard Falk, Professor, Princeton University."*
118. *) 1993, David Ray Griffin & Richard Falk, 'Postmodern Politics for a Planet in Crisis'.
*) 2004, David Ray Griffin (foreword by Richard Falk), 'The New Pearl Harbor'.
*) 2006, David Ray Griffin, Richard Falk, and John B. Cobb Jr., 'American Empire and the Commonwealth of God'.
*) 2007, David Ray Griffin (foreword by Richard Falk), 'Debunking 9/11 Debunking'.
119. Oct. 3, 2004, Angieon911.com (site of a nutty anti-NEW right-winger), 'David Ray Griffin Responds & So Do I' (copy-paste of a Sep. 13, 2004 email of David Ray Griffin)'.
120. Oct. 3, 2004, Angieon911.com (site of a nutty anti-NEW right-winger), 'David Ray Griffin Responds & So Do I' (copy-paste of a Sep. 13, 2004 email of David Ray Griffin)'.
121. american-iranian.org/Pages/AboutAIC /Leadership/LShipMain.html (accessed: Jan. 10, 2002; two days before Cyrus Vance died): *"Honorary Board: ... Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Honorary AIC Chairman."*
122. american-iranian.org/Pages/AboutAIC /Leadership/LShipMain.html (accessed: Jan. 10, 2002): *"Honorary Board: ... Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Honorary AIC Chairman. Former US Secretary of State. Honorable Donna Shalala, Former US Secretary of Health & Human Services. ... Sargent Shriver, Chairman, Special Olympics. ... Dr. David A. Hamburg.*
Board of Directors: ... Chas. W. Freeman, Jr. ... Robert H. Pelletreau, chair [AIC]... Robert Gallucci ... Nicholas Platt ... Frank G. Wisner, Vice Chairman, American International Group. ... Thomas R. Pickering, Senior VP, International Relations, The Boeing Company. ... David Lesar, Chairman of the Board, President & CEO, Halliburton Company. ... Richard H. Matzke, Vice Chairman, Chevron Corporation. ... David I. McEvoy, Business Development Vice President, ExxonMobil Corporation... Lucio Noto, Former Vice Chairman, ExxonMobil Corporation. ... J. Bennett Johnston ... Ambassador Richard W. Murphy, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations. ... Judith Kipper, Member of Executive Committee [of AIC], Director, Middle Eastern Studies, CSIS...
Advisory Council: ... Richard Falk, Professor, Princeton University. ... Jerrold D. Green, Director, RAND's Center for Middle East Public Policy. ... Alireza Moshiri, Advisor to the Vice Chairman of the Board,

Chevron Overseas Petrolerum Inc. ... Gary Marfin, Manager, Government Affairs, Conoco, Inc."

123. Ibid.
124. Ibid.
125. Ibid. An August 10, 2001 webarchive shows Falk and all the same people as the Jan. 10, 2002 one.
126. Ibid.
127. March 11, 2009, Al Jazeera, 'US diplomat resigns from intelligence post over Israel criticism': *"The "Israel Lobby", he argued..."*
128. April 28, 2021, Tablet Magazine, 'Washington's Weirdest Think Tank': *"Chas Freeman: "[I was] part of the group consulted about [Quincy's] formation. ... I think the main organizer was Trita Parsi, and perhaps that was a product of his disappointment as head of NIAC..."""*
129. rbf.org/about/our-history/timeline/iran-project (accessed: April 5, 2026): *"2002:..."*
130. iranprojectfcsny.org/core-member-bios/ (accessed: May 17, 2014).
131. May 25, 2017, Tablet Magazine, 'The Rockefeller Brothers Fund and BDS'.
132. dohaforum.org/speakers/h.e.-dr.-mohammad-javad-zarif (accessed: April 7, 2026).
133. Ibid.
134. Ibid.
135. May 25, 2017, Tablet Magazine, 'The Rockefeller Brothers Fund and BDS'.
136. dohaforum.org/speakers/h.e.-dr.-mohammad-javad-zarif (accessed: April 7, 2026): *"Dr. Zarif served as Iran's deputy foreign minister (1992-2202 [sic: 2002]), permanent representative to the United Nations (2002-2007) and foreign minister (2013-2021)."*
137. Ibid.
138. Ibid.
139. July 18, 2019, Time, 'The U.S. 'Shot Itself in the Foot' by Pulling Out of the Nuclear Deal, Iranian Foreign Minister Says': *"Zarif, who has been Iran's foreign minister since 2013, was the lead negotiator in the multi-party nuclear accord reached in 2015 during the Obama administration that Trump has repeatedly called the "worst deal ever.""*
140. March 03, 2025, Radio Free Europe, 'Iran Vice President Zarif Resigns Amid Government Turmoil In Tehran': *"Iranian Vice President for Strategic Affairs Mohammad Javad Zarif has stepped down..."*
141. June 2004, Hooshang Amirahmadi "confidential" note, located on a server of the New York Times (download PDF).
142. rbf.org/news/rbf-releases-report-us-iran-track-ii-dialogue (accessed: April 5, 2026).

143. Ibid. [11]: *"Starting in 2001... for the past 16 years, the [Rockefeller Brothers] Fund has organized dialogues between prominent American and Iranian figures. ... [RBF president] Heintz told me that he attended "probably around five or six" Iran Project meetings at [Bush's and Obama's] National Security Council, along with a similar number at the State Department and other agencies. ... RBF was similarly strategic about its own role in funding the Obama administration's public push for the [2015] Iran Deal."*
144. rbf.org/about/our-history/timeline/iran-project (accessed: April 5, 2026).
145. 2012 annual report, International Crisis Group, p. 2: *"Thomas R. Pickering... He has been Co-Chair of Crisis Group since April 2006 and Chair from April 2010."*
146. ihouse-nyc.org/s/707/index.aspx? sid=707&gid=1&pgid=265 (accessed: July 14, 2012): *"Honorary Trustees: Honorary Chairman: David Rockefeller. Henry A. Kissinger. ... Daisy M. Soros '51. Paul A. Volcker. John C. Whitehead. Chairman of the Board: Frank G. Wisner... [Photo:] Former Chairman of the Board Paul A. Volcker. [Photo:] Honorary Chairman David Rockefeller with Honorary Trustees Daisy Soros and John Whitehead."*
147. *) 1998 annual report, RBF, pp. 8-9: *"William H. Luers stepped down as a trustee in June after serving three three-year terms, the maximum permitted by the by-laws, and in recognition of his exceptional contributions to the work of the Fund, he was elected an advisory trustee. Russel E. Train was re-elected as an advisory trustee. ...*

[p. 9:] The date was October 1983 [when] the [RBF] report went on to propose the adoption of a global theme, called "One World," that has embodied the Fund's (and the Rockefeller family's) traditional interest in international affairs and linked the RBF's programs in sustainable resource use and world security for the past fifteen years..."

*) 1999 annual report, RBF, p. 7: *"RBF Trustees: Front row (left to right): Neva Goodwin, Steven Rockefeller, ... David Rockefeller, Jr. ... Row (left to right): ... William Luers (Advisory Trustee)... Peggy Dulany ... Not present: ... Frank Wisner..."*

*) 2001 annual review, RBF, p. 94: *"Trustees & Officers: ... William H. Luers [2], United Nations Association of the United States of America. ... David Rockefeller [2] ... Laurance S. Rockefeller [2] ... Frank G. Wisner ... David Rockefeller, Jr. ... Richard G. Rockefeller ... Steven C. Rockefeller... Neva R. [Rockefeller] Goodwin ... Peggy Dulany [Rockefeller]... [2] Advisory Trustee."*

*) 2003 annual review, RBF, p. 3: *"Advisory Trustees: ... William H. Luers, President United Nations Association... Richard D. Parsons, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer Time Warner, Inc. ... David*

Rockefeller ... Laurance S. Rockefeller [1] ... [1] Deceased, July 11, 2004."

148. 1998-2007 RBF annual reports.
149. refugeesinternational.org/ about/board.html (accessed: July 2, 2001): *"[TMB], Vice Chair... Board Members: ... Robert P. DeVecchi, [CFR] ... [of] Hasbro Inc. Robert Trent Jones, Jr. / Robert Trent Jones II. ... James Lowenstein, APCO Associates. Ken Miller, CS First Boston. Constance J. Milstein, Milstein Properties. Charles Monat, Charles Monat, Ltd. Julia Ormond, Actress. George Soros... Sam Waterston, Actor. Frank Wisner, American International Group."*
150. 2012 annual report, International Crisis Group, p. 2: *"Thomas R. Pickering... He has been Co-Chair of Crisis Group since April 2006 and Chair from April 2010."* Co-chair again by 2014.
151. refugeesinternational.org/ about/board.html (accessed: July 2, 2001).
152. Sep. 13, 2012, 'TRITA PARSI and NATIONAL IRANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, plaintiffs, v. SEID HASSAN DAIOLESLAM, Defendant. Civil Action. No. 08-705 (JDB). ecf.dcd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2008cv0705-189 (accessed: April 8, 2026).
153. May 11, 2014, ncr-iran.org (National Council of Resistance in Iran), 'Iranian regime lobby: Tehran's men in Washington' (translation of a May 6, 2014 article in Asharq al-Awsat): *"For a decade, Parsi has been a close friend of Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif. From the time when Zarif was his country's permanent representative in the UN in New York, in the mid-2000s, he was accused by Iranian dissident Hassan Dai'al-Islam of taking part in activities in favor of the regime's interests.*
Parsi himself filed a court suit against Dai'al-Islam. The court ordered Parsi's e-mail account to be opened for it to be clarified that he was in contact with Zarif, and he had been arranging meetings between Congressmen from both sides of the house with this Iranian official.
His e-mails clarified that Zarif and Parsi met for the first time back in March 2006. Zarif gave Parsi a document entitled 'The Grand Deal' which the Iranians had given to the Americans during the Iraq war in 2003, and Washington had rejected."
154. dohaforum.org/speakers/h.e.-dr.-mohammad-javad-zarif (accessed: April 7, 2026).
155. Ibid.
156. Ibid.
157. May 25, 2017, Tablet Magazine, 'The Rockefeller Brothers Fund and BDS'.
158. dohaforum.org/speakers/h.e.-dr.-mohammad-javad-zarif (accessed: April 7, 2026): *"Dr. Zarif served as Iran's deputy foreign minister*

(1992-2202 [sic: 2002]), permanent representative to the United Nations (2002-2007) and foreign minister (2013-2021)."

159. Ibid.
160. Ibid.
161. July 18, 2019, Time, 'The U.S. 'Shot Itself in the Foot' by Pulling Out of the Nuclear Deal, Iranian Foreign Minister Says': *"Zarif, who has been Iran's foreign minister since 2013, was the lead negotiator in the multi-party nuclear accord reached in 2015 during the Obama administration that Trump has repeatedly called the "worst deal ever.""*
162. March 3, 2025, Radio Free Europe, 'Iran Vice President Zarif Resigns Amid Government Turmoil In Tehran': *"Iranian Vice President for Strategic Affairs Mohammad Javad Zarif has stepped down..."*
163. Jan. 17, 2020, National Council for Resistance of Iran (ncr-iran.org), 'Iranian Regime's Lobby Group NIAC Under Scrutiny'.
164. Oct. 12, 2018, Arab News, 'Iran's nuclear defiance should not be ignored': *"More than a decade ago [in 2002], the opposition National Council for Resistance of Iran (NCRI) revealed that Tehran was conducting secret nuclear activities at two major sites, Natanz and Arak."*
165. Jan. 17, 2020, National Council for Resistance of Iran (ncr-iran.org), 'Iranian Regime's Lobby Group NIAC Under Scrutiny'.
166. niacouncil.org/index.php? option=com_content&task=view &id=1031&Itemid=166 (accessed: Sep. 28, 2008; Pickering, etc. not in the March 2008 screenshots yet.): *"ADVISORY BOARD: The Honorable Thomas Pickering, former Under Secretary of State (Bio). The Honorable Wayne Gilchrest (Bio) The Honorable Jim Moody (Bio)."*
167. niacouncil.org/about-niac/staff-board/ (accessed: Dec. 13, 2019; Full range: Oct. 26, 2014 - Dec. 6, 2019; by early 2020 the advisory board was gone): *"Board of Advisors: ... Thomas R. Pickering. Ambassador John Limbert. ... Wayne Gilchrest... Jim Moody..."*
168. Feb. 14, 2005, OpenSocietyFoundations.org, 'Immigrant Communities in the Crossfire': *"Today... we support organizations like the Arab-American Institute Foundation, the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services, the National Iranian-American Council, and the Arab-American Justice Project..."*
169. *) 2013, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Form 990-PF, p. 24: *"National Iranian American Council: ... Approved in 2014: ... $50,000."*

    *) 2014, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Form 990-PF, p. 100: *"National Iranian American Council: ... Approved in 2014: $40,000."*

    *) 2015, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Form 990-PF, p. 29: *"National Iranian American Council: ... Approved in 2015: ... $40,000. ... Paid in 2014: ... $40,000."*

    *) 2018, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Form 990-PF, p. 126: *"National Iranian American Council: ... Approved in 2018: ... $80,000. ... Paid in*

2018: ... $40,000."

*) 2019, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Form 990-PF, p. 147: *"National Iranian American Council: ... Approved in 2019: ... $40,000. ... Paid in 2019: ... $40,000."*

*) rbf.org/grantees/national-iranian-american-council (accessed: April 7, 2026): *"Grants: $75,000 for 7 months. Awarded: Feb 4, 2022. For its project, Delivering Vaccine Equity for Sanctioned Countries and Saving Iran Diplomacy. ... $100,000 for 24 months. Awarded: Mar 16, 2021. For general support. Peacebuilding. Constituencies for Peace."*

170. Feb. 1, 2023, Washington Free Beacon, 'Koch, Soros Operatives Host Secret Meeting To Plot Iran Nuke Deal Revival': *"Activists from groups including J Street, NIAC Action, the Open Society Foundations, Human Rights Watch, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund are coming together [for a virtual reality meeting] to revive negotiations for a nuclear deal with Iran. That's according to a January email sent from a J Street lobbyist to other activists and obtained by the Free Beacon. ... The activists gathered for a strategy meeting during the week of Dec. 3 [2022] at the Pocantico Center at Kykuit, the John D. Rockefeller family's estate in Westchester County, New York, a source familiar with the discussions told the Free Beacon. ...*

The activist groups "plan ... to give pro-deal Democrats cover by supporting Iranian women and Iranian human rights [and get them] to write a very public letter to the president urging him to keep the door to diplomacy over on the nuclear file," a source familiar with the discussions told the Free Beacon. ...

J Street's [Dylan] Williams sent the email to a small group of activists, including NIAC Action's Ryan Costello, Open Society's Mike Amitay, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace's Matt Duss. These groups have all received funding from either George Soros or Charles Koch, both political megadonors."

171. April 21, 2017, Politico, 'State Dept. official reassigned amid conservative media attacks': *"Multiple stories on Breitbart and other conservative sites pointed out that she once worked for the National Iranian American Council, which some critics allege has links to the Iranian government. But Nowrouzzadeh's defenders note that she was merely an intern at NIAC as a college undergraduate, and that the advocacy group did not take positions on U.S. policy while she was there. NIAC, which is now more politically active, has denied working on behalf of Iran's government."*

172. thebulletin.org/biography/sahar-nowrouzzadeh/ (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; accessed: April 4, 2026): *"Sahar Nowrouzzadeh is a joint research fellow with the Iran Project and the Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University's Belfer Center for*

Science and International Affairs. Beginning her tenure as a career civil servant within the US government in 2005, she has focused on Iran under three US administrations. She served as a director for Iran and Iran nuclear implementation on the White House National Security Council staff from 2014 to 2016 and covered Iran on the secretary of state's policy planning staff between 2016 and 2017."

173. April 21, 2017, Politico, 'State Dept. official reassigned amid conservative media attacks'.
174. March 11, 2026 YouTube upload by 'Globle politics', 'Steve Bannon, John Solomon, Trita Parsi, Eric Bolling'.
175. April 6, 2026 YouTube upload by 'Democracy Now!', ' "He Is Increasingly Desperate": Trita Parsi on Trump's Expletive-Laced Threats Against Iran'.
176. quincyinst.org/about/ (accessed: Dec. 8, 2019): *"Leadership: ... Francis Najafi [Iranian businessman and 2005 founder Pivotal Fdn.]... Tom Pickering... Team: ... Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President...*
Our Supporters: ... Nasiri Foundation. Open Society Foundations. Pivotal Foundation."
177. April 28, 2021, Tablet Magazine, 'Washington's Weirdest Think Tank'.
178. quincyinst.org/about/ (accessed: Dec. 8, 2019): *"Leadership: ... Andrew Bacevich, President... Suzanne DiMaggio, Chairman [and] is a senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment... [Gen.] Paul Eaton. Stephen Heintz [president RBF]... Francis Najafi [Iranian businessman and 2005 founder Pivotal Fdn.]... Tom Pickering...*
Team: Jim Lobe, Editorial Director... Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President...
Our Supporters: ... Charles Koch Foundation. Colombe Foundation. Nasiri Foundation. Open Society Foundations. Pivotal Foundation. Ploughshares Fund. Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The Arca Foundation."
179. quincyinst.org/about/ (accessed: Dec. 8, 2019): *"Leadership: ... Tom Pickering, Board Member... Team: ... Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President..."*
180. April 28, 2021, Tablet Magazine, 'Washington's Weirdest Think Tank': *"Chas Freeman: "[I was] part of the group consulted about [Quincy's] formation. ... I think the main organizer was Trita Parsi, and perhaps that was a product of his disappointment as head of NIAC..."""*
181. quincyinst.org/experts/ (accessed: Jan. 13, 2020; first webarchive, but all or almost all already there in 2019, based on Dec. 2019 webarchives of other pages): *"Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President... William H. Luers, Distinguished Fellow... John Mearsheimer, Fellow... Stephen Walt, Fellow... Gary Sick, Distinguished Fellow [who pushed the 1980 October Surprise, and disinfo that Iraq was*

tied to 9/11]... Lawrence Wilkerson, Fellow... Eli Clifton, Director, Democratizing Foreign Policy Program..."

182. quincyinst.org/about/ (accessed: Dec. 8, 2019): *"Leadership: ... Tom Pickering, Board Member... Team: ... Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President..."*
183. quincyinst.org/experts/ (accessed: Jan. 13, 2020; first webarchive, but all or almost all already there in 2019, based on Dec. 2019 webarchives of other pages): *"Trita Parsi, Executive Vice President... William H. Luers, Distinguished Fellow... John Mearsheimer, Fellow... Stephen Walt, Fellow... Gary Sick, Distinguished Fellow [who pushed the 1980 October Surprise, and disinfo that Iraq was tied to 9/11]... Lawrence Wilkerson, Fellow... Eli Clifton, Director, Democratizing Foreign Policy Program..."*
184. June 15, 2016, The Guardian, 'Iran announces deal worth billions to buy up to 100 Boeing aircraft'.
185. Aug. 14, 2016, Commentary, 'Exposing Iran's Boeing Lie'.
186. Jan. 27, 2010, New York Times, 'In Davos, Signs of Shift in Global Power': *"[Nicolas Sarkozy, president of France 2007-2012, at Davos 2004:] The G-20 is a harbinger of global governance in the 21st century..."* The G20 was pushed for by the secretive "Shadow G8" since the 1990s, involving Klaus Schwab's old mentor, Henry Kissinger. Sarkozy was a Davos "Young Global Leader" for 1992, alongside future heads of state Tony Blair, Gordon Brown, Angela Merkel, Jose Maria Aznar, and Jose Manuel Barroso.
187. July 31, 2025, Javad Zarif for The Guardian (a "lefty" publication co-founded by the Rockefeller and Ford foundations), 'In this time of rancour, fear and war, peaceful nuclear cooperation in the Middle East is still possible': *"As far back as 1974, Iran proposed a zone free from nuclear weapons in the Middle East at the UN, and was soon joined by Egypt. ... But for half a century, progress has been blocked by Israel and its main patron, the United States."*
188. Nov. 18, 2019, Pew Research, 'Europeans and Americans Share Concerns About Iran's Nuclear Program; Russians Less Worried'.
189. June 19, 2025, Fdn. for the Defense of Democracies (fdd.org), 'CNN Poll Shows Clear Majority of Americans Opposed to Nuclear-Armed Iran'.
190. *) June 20, 2025, Cato Institute (cato.org), 'Americans Don't Want Another War in the Middle East'.
    *) harvardharrispoll.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/HHP_June2025_Crosstabs.pdf (accessed: March 26, 2026).
191. June 21, 2025, Fox News, 'Americans agree with Trump that Iran poses threat to United States: poll; Nearly three in four voters now see Iran as a real security threat amid escalating Middle East tensions'.

192. *) June 20, 2025, Cato Institute (cato.org), 'Americans Don't Want Another War in the Middle East'.
*) harvardharrispoll.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/HHP_June2025_Crosstabs.pdf (accessed: March 26, 2026).
193. Ibid.
194. June 23, 2025, YouGov.com, 'Snap polls: More Americans oppose than support the U.S. bombing of Iran'.
195. March 6, 2026, maristpoll.marist.edu, 'War with Iran, March 2026: Majority of Americans Disapprove of U.S. Military Action in Iran'.
196. March 25, 2026, AP, 'Most Americans say US military action against Iran has gone too far, a new AP-NORC poll finds'.
197. March 25, 2026, AP, 'Most Americans say US military action against Iran has gone too far, a new AP-NORC poll finds'.
198. March 25, 2026, Breitbart, 'Poll: Most Americans Say U.S. Military Action Against Iran Has Gone Too Far'.
199. March 19, 2026, Reuters, 'Americans think Trump will send ground troops to Iran and don't support it, Reuters/Ipsos poll finds'.
200. March 3, 2026, AOL.com, 'Sharp partisan divide emerges over Iran strike, Trump's strategy: polls'.
201. Ibid.
202. documentcloud.org/documents/27753274-260072-nbc-march-2026-poll-03-04-2026-release/ (accessed: March 26, 2026).
203. March 6, 2026, maristpoll.marist.edu, 'War with Iran, March 2026: Majority of Americans Disapprove of U.S. Military Action in Iran'.
204. March 6, 2026, NPR, 'Poll: A majority of Americans opposes U.S. military action in Iran'.
205. May 14, 2025, University of Manchester study / Cambridge University Press, 'Gender Vote Gaps Among Ethnic Minority Voters in Britain': *"Ethnic minority groups are overwhelmingly likely to vote for Labour and particularly unlikely to vote for the Conservative Party (Heath et al. 2013). ... Labour's electoral coalition in 2019 relied on younger women voters and ethnic minorities... Despite an overall disastrous result in 2019, Labour still won 90 per cent of the fifty-eight seats in 2019, where at least half of residents belonged to an ethnic minority. ...*
Ethnic minority voters have been particularly likely to vote for the Labour Party since at least the 1980s, and this pattern was sustained in 2017 and 2019 (Martin and Sobolewska Reference Martin and Sobolewska 2023). According to Understanding Society data, 85–92 per cent of voters from Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black Caribbean or Black African ethnic groups voted for Labour in 2017 or 2019, and only 6–13 per cent for the Conservatives. Even among Indian ethnicity voters – seen as more pro-Conservative due to rising affluence – just over a third (36 per cent) voted Conservative in 2019, but half (53 per cent) voted for Labour. ...
At the same time, after decades of almost no gender differences in

vote choice, since the 2017 general election, women have been more likely to vote for Labour and men for the Conservatives (Campbell and Shorrocks Reference Campbell and Shorrocks2021), a shift linked to both austerity policies and Brexit.""

206. Nov. 18, 2019, Pew Research, 'Europeans and Americans Share Concerns About Iran's Nuclear Program; Russians Less Worried'.
207. June 16, 2025, Cityam.com, '84 per cent of Brits want Iran blocked from developing nuclear weapons': *"A huge 84 per cent of Brits say that Iran should be stopped from developing nuclear weapons, with 44 per cent supporting UK military efforts to intervene, according to polling from think tank More in Common."*
208. Ibid.
209. March 5, 2026, YouGov.com, 'UK public opinion on the US-Iran conflict'.
210. Ibid.
211. March 5, 2026, YouGov.com, 'UK public opinion on the US-Iran conflict'.
212. yougov.com/en-gb/daily-results/20260302-14ed5-1 (published: March 2, 2026; accessed: March 25, 2026; 'Do you support or oppose the military action that the United States has taken against Iran?').
213. March 5, 2026, YouGov.com, 'UK public opinion on the US-Iran conflict'.
214. Ibid.
215. yougov.com/en-gb/daily-results/20260302-14ed5-3 (published: March 2, 2026; accessed: March 25, 2026; 'How do you think the UK should respond diplomatically to the US-led attacks against Iran?'.
216. March 5, 2026, YouGov.com, 'UK public opinion on the US-Iran conflict'.
217. March 15, 2018, BBC, 'Saudi Arabia pledges to create a nuclear bomb if Iran does'.
218. Feb. 10, 2026, Bloomberg, 'Turkey Says It Could Be Dragged Into Nuclear Arms Race Over Iran'.
219. Aug. 21, 2025, IranIntl.com, 'Majority of Iranians reject Islamic Republic, survey finds': *"The Group for Analyzing and Measuring Attitudes in Iran (GAMAAN), which conducted the survey in June 2024, said it polled more than 77,000 respondents inside Iran... Only around 20 percent of respondents want the Islamic Republic to remain in power, according to the survey. ... Support for the principles of the 1979 revolution and the Supreme Leader fell to 11 percent, down from 18 percent in 2022. By contrast, some 40 percent of participants said regime change was a precondition for reform, while another 24 percent favored a structural transition away from the current system."*

220. Nov. 16, 2025, NBC News, 'Taps run dry as water crisis forces Iran to consider evacuating its capital; A prolonged drought along with years of overconsumption, an inefficient agricultural sector and mismanagement have led to the problem, analysts say.'.
221. March 15, 2026, New York Post, 'Captain of Iranian women's soccer team is latest to withdraw asylum bid: 'Family members are missing''.
222. Jan. 8, 2026 Youtube upload by 'PowNews', 'Iran massaal de straat op tegen islamitisch regime: 'Levensgevaarlijk!'' ('Iran takes to the streets en masse against Islamic regime: 'Life-threatening!'): *"[Narrator:] Bloody nationwide protests have been underway in Iran for ten days now. Thirty people have already died. Is this the end of the Ayatollah regime? And why do we hear so incredibly little here in the Netherlands? [Writer and Comite Iran Vrij director Keyvan Shahbazi:] They wanted me to go to the embassy and report there. Yes, they said to me, "We know everything about you. Don't think for a moment that we don't know where you live and where you work.""*
223. July 31, 2025, Le Monde, 'US and allies accuse Iran of plotting assassinations in the West; The warning issued Thursday by the United States and 14 allies follows foiled attacks in the UK, Netherlands, Spain, and the US. '.
224. *) Sep. 12, 2020, New York Post, 'Iran executes wrestler despite plea from Trump to spare his life': "Supporters of the wrestler ... have insisted Afkari was a political prisoner who was unfairly targeted because of his participation in the protests. ... Afkari's two brothers, Vahid and Habib, who attended the protest with him, were slapped with prison terms of 54 and 27 years, respectively, along with 74 lashes."

    *) March 19, 2026, New York Post, 'Iran executes 19-year-old champion wrestler Saleh Mohammadi, two others in horrific public hangings': *"Mohammadi, a rising star from Qom, was allegedly tortured to confess to the capital crime of waging war against God, with the teen executed without a fair trial, according to human rights groups."*
225. Sep. 25, 2025, Daily Mail, 'How people are being hanged from cranes and strangled to death over 45 minutes while crowds of excited families watch as part of Iran's mass execution campaign that's killed more than 1,000.'.
226. Jan. 27, 2026, The Guardian, 'Disappeared bodies, mass burials and '30,000 dead': what is the truth of Iran's death toll? Testimony from medics, morgue and graveyard staff reveals huge state effort to conceal systematic killing of protesters'.
227. Feb. 20, 2026, NewsNationNow.com, 'Imprisoned Iranian protesters are being tortured and raped, sources say': *""I am most worried about the people who got arrested. They are raping men and women in jail. They are being raped every day by (a) group of police," they*

[the witnesses we talked to] said. ... An Iranian refugee who spoke to NewsNation under a condition of anonymity for fear of reprisal said, "All of us who were arrested in prison were subjected to gang rape by masked men, at gunpoint and under their mockery. They believe that because our beliefs are different from theirs, we are their sexual slaves and that they can rape us in any way they want." ... "Some of the women's bodies that were returned to their families were missing their wombs so that the crimes could not be traced or investigated. To be honest, most families did not pursue the matter further in order to avoid even more suffering," the refugee said. ... Shaghayegh Moradiannejad, an Iranian photographer who fled the country five years ago for her and her family's safety, told NewsNation this has "always been the regime's method" to rape and torture. "During interrogations, they squeeze their (women's) breasts, use obscene and degrading language, and subject them to sexual abuse," Moradiannejad said."

228. *) March 23, 1984, The Age, 'Iran using children to clear minefields'.
*) 2011, Mordecai Dzikansky, Gil Kleiman and Robert Slater, 'Terrorist Suicide Bombings: Attack Interdiction, Mitigation, and Response', p. 26: *"The first modern suicide bombing took place in Iran in 1980 when a 13-year-old boy blew himself up while running up to an Iraqi tank early in the Iran-Iraq War."*
229. *) Ibid.
*) The December 1981 bombing of the Iraqi embassy in Beirut bombing preceded the April 1983 U.S. embassy in Beirut bombing and the October 1983 Beirut barracks bombing. The latter killed 241 U.S. and 58 French servicemen. The bombings not only were retaliation for U.S. involvement in Lebanon, but also for its support of Iraq in the Iraq-Iran War of the 1980s.
230. March 20, 2026, New York Post, 'Iran makes chilling threat to target tourist sites worldwide — as spring break kicks off in US': *"Iranian military spokesman Gen. Abolfazl Shekarchi [said on TV:] "From now on, based on the information we have about you, even parks, recreational areas, and tourist destinations anywhere in the world will no longer be safe for you.""*
231. June 19, 2025, Fdn. for the Defense of Democracies (fdd.org), 'Israeli Leaders Threaten to Eliminate Khamenei After Iranian Missile Strikes Hospital'.
232. March 29, 2026, Human Rights Watch, 'Iran: Unlawful Cluster Munition Strikes on Israel; Indiscriminate Weapon Kills at Least 4 Civilians'.
233. March 12, 2026, CNN, 'How Iran's use of cluster munitions is challenging Israel's air defenses'.
234. *) March 30, 2016, Human Rights Watch (HRW.org), 'Iran: Military Stepping Up Child Recruitment; Campaign Lowers Minimum Age to

12'.

*) March 30, 2026, The Telegraph, 'Iran recruits 12-year-olds to 'defend homeland''.

*) Note: It was almost impossible to find a mainstream western media outlet reporting this, at least through Google.

235. April 7, 2026, The Guardian, 'Iran calls on young people to form human chains around power plants as Trump deadline looms'.
236. March 27, 2026, Reuters, 'Gulf states tell US ending the war is not enough, Iran's capabilities must be degraded'.
237. March 31, 2026, Al Jazeera, 'Qatar says Iran's attacks on neighbours crossed 'many red lines''.
238. March 1, 2026, Le Monde, 'Iran attacks luxury hotels and airports in Dubai; Explosions rocked many of the city's major landmarks and revenue-earners, including the Palm Jumeirah man-made island, the Burj Al Arab ultra-luxury hotel and Dubai airport.'.
239. March 31, 2026, Al Jazeera, 'Qatar says Iran's attacks on neighbours crossed 'many red lines''.
240. Dec. 30, 2016, ynetnews.com, 'Ex-CIA director: I was sure if we didn't strike Syria's nuclear reactor, Israel would'.
241. July 2012, Steven L. Rearden (official Joint Chiefs publication), 'Council of War: A History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: 1942-1991', p. 160: *"The initial test of the limited-objectives strategy was President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" speech to the United Nations in December 1953. Sidestepping the stalled disarmament debate, the President stressed the peaceful potential of nuclear power and the need to "hasten the day when fear of the atom will begin to disappear." To coordinate peaceful applications, he proposed the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a watered-down version of the international control body envisioned under the Baruch Plan. Based in Vienna, Austria, the IAEA began operating in 1957. [118]"*
242. Ibid.: *""*
243. Ibid., pp. 134, 160, 162: *"Knowing that rapid and radical changes could cost him the cooperation of the chiefs and of their supporters on Capitol Hill, he started slowly with modest adjustments. The blue-print he used was a Defense-wide reorganization derived from suggestions offered by former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett and the recommendations of an advisory panel headed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Eisenhower's protégé. Presented to Congress in April 1953, these changes, known as Reorganization Plan Number 6, took effect under an Executive order in June and required no further legislative action in the absence of congressional objections. ...*
[p. 160:] The administration's most ambitious initiative, unveiled by the President on July 21, 1955, at the Geneva summit, was the "Open Skies" proposal to allow [mutual] aerial photography of U.S. and Soviet military installations. ... The proposal aimed to build trust

[towards] credible arms control agreement. [11] Though the precise origins of the offer remain vague, Eisenhower claimed that it arose from studies done by his assistant, Nelson A. Rockefeller, in the weeks leading up to the conference, on avoiding a surprise attack through a system of mutual inspections. [120] ...

[p. 162:] At the President's request, Rockefeller organized a special "vulnerabilities panel" made up of social scientists and intelligence experts to assess the prospects for improved verification. The group met at the Quantico, Virginia, Marine Corps base in early June 1955, and it was from these discussions that the aerial inspections proposal emerged. [129] With time running short, Rockefeller made no attempt to solicit JCS views. Instead, he met a few days prior to the Geneva conference in Paris with Radford and Gruenther to discuss the plan. Both agreed that the United States stood to gain more than it would lose. According to Secretary of State Dulles, who was also present, Radford was "in complete accord and indeed enthusiastic." [130]"

244. Ibid.
245. June 24, 1955, Pakistan Affairs (U.S. Embassey of Washington, D.C. publication), 'U.S. and Pakistan Initial "Atoms-for-Peace" Program'.
246. Feb. 1, 2015, American Institute of Physics (physicstoday.aip.org), 'Pakistan's nuclear Taj Mahal': *"To this day, PINSTECH [Pakistan Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology] stands out as the unchallenged architectural advertisement for Atoms for Peace ... the 1966 opening of "Pakistan's First Atomic Reactor" ...*

15 Pakistanis sent to Argonne National Laboratory's short course in nuclear engineering, a one-year training program for international students that was established in 1954 with stipends provided by the US Agency for International Development. Argonne, in cooperation with fledgling nuclear engineering programs at North Carolina State University, the Pennsylvania State University, MIT, and other universities, provided rigorous, hands-on training for the scientists and engineers who would run Atoms for Peace reactors. Among those who graduated from the course was Munir Ahmad Khan, destined to be a powerful advocate of nuclear weapons who would replace Usmani as PAEC [Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission] chairman in a "guns versus butter" struggle over Pakistan's nuclear future. ...

In an attempt to jump-start reactor development, [Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission chairman I.H.] Usmani [picked by dictator general Ayub Khan] and Salam revived a moribund agreement between Pakistan and the US that had been signed in the mid 1950s under the auspices of Atoms for Peace. As a result, the two men received a promise of $350 000 to support the construction of a 5-MW swimming-pool-type research reactor. The US also agreed to

provide the enriched uranium fuel elements for the reactor, with the explicit understanding that all fissionable material would be kept under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and subject to inspection. Pakistan would fund the rest of the estimated $3.5 million project itself, and the US would pay its share only after the reactor went critical. ...

By 1961 PAEC had placed 70 Pakistanis in training at US Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) laboratories and an equal number in places like the UK Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell, Britain's main center for reactor R&D, and Chalk River Laboratories, its Canadian counterpart. ...

For a new generation of Pakistani scientists, war with India had tipped the balance in favor of nuclear weapons. By the 1970s PINSTECH had 350 nuclear scientists in training—100 in the reactor school and the rest in divisions ...

"

247. July 2012, Steven L. Rearden (official Joint Chiefs publication), 'Council of War: A History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: 1942-1991', p. 160: *"President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" speech to the United Nations [was] in December 1953. ... To coordinate peaceful applications, he proposed the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a watered-down version of the international control body envisioned under the Baruch Plan. Based in Vienna, Austria, the IAEA began operating in 1957. [118]"*
248. Aug. 17, 2021, United States Institute for Peace, 'Timeline of Iran's Nuclear Activities'. iranprimer.usip.org/resource/timeline-irans-nuclear-activities (accessed: March 20, 2026): *"1957. The United States and Iran signed a civil nuclear cooperation agreement as part of the United States Atoms for Peace program. The agreement provided for U.S. technical assistance and the lease of enriched uranium to Iran. It also called for research cooperation on peaceful nuclear energy uses."*
249. Ibid.
250. Ibid.
251. Ibid.
252. Ibid.
253. Ibid.
254. Ibid.
255. Ibid.
256. armscontrol.org/research-reports/2014-06/section-1-background-status-irans-nuclear-program (accessed: April 9, 2026; Arms Control Association).
257. nti.org/education-center/facilities/natanz-enrichment-complex/ (accessed: March 21, 2026; Updated/last reviewed Jun 25, 2025; Nuclear Threat Initiative).

258. 2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ prs/ps/2003/20439.htm (accessed: March 21, 2026; 'Taken Question from May 8, 2003 Daily Press Briefing' by assistant secretary of state for Public Affairs Richard Boucher): *"Iran has acknowledged both the heavy water production plant at Arak and the uranium enrichment facility at Natanz, but did so only after their existence was disclosed to the press in August 2002...*
Iran's only nuclear power reactor expected to become operational within the next decade is the light-water reactor under construction with Russian help at Bushehr. This raises serious questions about Iran's [about] Arak [because] heavy-water moderated reactors are better suited for plutonium production than are light water reactors.
...
Although Iran initially delayed the visit, IAEA Director General ElBaradei visited the Natanz site in late February and found what appeared to be a "sophisticated" centrifuge uranium enrichment program. We are deeply concerned at Iran's efforts to build that facility clandestinely, and believe there is no logical reason for Iran to pursue uranium enrichment other than to support a weapons capability, especially in light of Russia's pledge to provide all the fuel for the lifetime of the Bushehr reactor."
259. Aug. 17, 2021, United States Institute for Peace, 'Timeline of Iran's Nuclear Activities'.
iranprimer.usip.org/resource/timeline-irans-nuclear-activities
(accessed: March 20, 2026).
260. nti.org/education-center/facilities/natanz-enrichment-complex/ (accessed: March 21, 2026; Updated/last reviewed Jun 25, 2025; Nuclear Threat Initiative).
261. Dec. 30, 2016, ynetnews.com, 'Ex-CIA director: I was sure if we didn't strike Syria's nuclear reactor, Israel would'.
262. Ibid.
263. Aug. 17, 2021, United States Institute for Peace, 'Timeline of Iran's Nuclear Activities'.
iranprimer.usip.org/resource/timeline-irans-nuclear-activities
(accessed: March 20, 2026).
264. Sep. 26, 2009, The Guardian, 'Why Iran confessed to secret nuclear site built inside mountain; At first it was one of many suspicious sites but forensic gathering of intelligence by the west eventually forced Iran to come clean'.
265. Nov. 8, 2011, Federation of American Scientists (FAS), 'IAEA Releases New Report on Iran's Nuclear Program'.
266. May 25, 2012, NPR, 'U.N. Nuclear Watchdog Finds Traces Of More Highly Enriched Uranium In Iran'.
267. June 20, 2012, Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS-online.org), 'Suspected Clean-Up Activity Continues at Parchin Military Complex'.

268. Sep. 16, 2015, Times of Israel, 'Iran: Russia to help us improve our centrifuges'.
269. July 16, 2015, Politifact.com, 'Deal puts Iran's nuclear program under lock, key and camera 24/7, says Rep. Don Beyer'.
270. April 21, 2017, Politico, 'State Dept. official reassigned amid conservative media attacks': *"Nowrouzzadeh... who helped shape the controversial [2015] Iran nuclear deal, had been detailed since last July [2016] to the secretary of state's policy planning team, where she handled ongoing issues related to Iran and Gulf Arab countries. Her yearlong assignment was cut short earlier this month, after critical stories... Nowrouzzadeh has returned to the Office of Iranian Affairs, but it would not specify her new role..."*
271. July 14, 2022, Institute for Science and International Security, 'The IR-6 Centrifuge Needs Further Development': *"In April 2019, the AEOI [Atomic Energy Organization of Iran] was operating only a small IR-6 cascade of 20-30 centrifuges. Subsequently, it moved relatively quickly to deploying its first production-scale cascade..."*
272. July 1, 2019, Die Welt, 'Iran passes agreed low-enriched uranium limit'.
273. Sep. 26, 2019, IAEA Board of Governors briefing document, 'Verification and monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran in light of United Nations Security Council resolution 2231 (2015)': *"On 5 September 2019, HE Hassan Rouhani, the President of Iran, stated "All of our commitments for research and development under the JCPOA will be completely removed by Friday [Sep. 6]". [2] On 7 September 2019, Iran informed the Agency that it intended to install ... additional advanced centrifuges. ... On 25 September 2019, the Agency verified that the reinstallation [of] a cascade of 164 IR-4 centrifuges and a cascade of 164 IR-2m centrifuges, was ongoing. [7] On the same day, the Agency verified that Iran had also started to reinstall IR-4 centrifuges in R&D line 4 and IR-2m centrifuges in R&D Line 5."*
274. Nov. 18, 2020, Reuters, 'Iran feeds uranium gas into advanced centrifuges underground - IAEA report': *"On 14 November 2020, the Agency verified that Iran began feeding UF6 into the recently installed cascade of 174 IR-2m centrifuges at the Fuel Enrichment Plant (FEP) in Natanz," the IAEA report to member states dated Tuesday said."*
275. Nov. 27, 2020, The Guardian, 'Iran vows retaliation after top nuclear scientist shot dead near Tehran'.
276. Jan. 4, 2021, BBC, 'Iran resumes enriching uranium to 20% purity at Fordo facility'.
277. June 9, 2025, isis-online.org, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — May 2025'.
278. April 12, 2021, Reuters, 'Iran blames Israel for Natanz nuclear plant outage, vows revenge'.

279. April 13, 2021, Al Jazeera, 'Iran to enrich uranium to 60 percent, highest level yet'.
280. July 14, 2022, Institute for Science and International Security, 'The IR-6 Centrifuge Needs Further Development'.
281. March 29, 2026, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 'Analysis: Iran likely transferred highly enriched uranium to Isfahan before the June strikes'.
282. Feb. 28, 2023, PBS, 'UN report says uranium particles enriched up to 83.7 percent found in Iran'.
283. March 7, 2023, Nuclear Engineering Magazine (NEImagazine), 'Grossi sees positive results from Iran trip'.
284. March 4, 2024, Institute for Science and International Security, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — February 2024'.
285. Feb. 25, 2021, Institute for Science and International Security, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report - February 2021': *"The IR-1 centrifuges at the FEP total 5060, for an estimated output of 4554 SWU/year, where each IR-1 is assumed to have a capacity of 0.9 SWU per year per when operating in a production-scale cascade."*
286. June 9, 2025, Reuters, 'Iran obtaining IAEA documents is 'bad', shows poor cooperation, Grossi says'.
287. Feb. 26, 2025, IAEA Board of Governors briefing document, 'NPT Safeguards Agreement with the Islamic Republic of Iran', p. 9.
288. June 12, 2025, Arms Control Association, 'Zero Enrichment: An Unnecessary, Unrealistic Objective to Prevent an Iranian Bomb'.
289. June 9, 2025, isis-online.org, 'Analysis of IAEA Iran Verification and Monitoring Report — May 2025'.
290. March 26, 2026, CNN, 'Trump is baffled that Iran won't end the war he started': *""The Iranian negotiators are very different and 'strange.' They are 'begging' us to make a deal, which they should be doing since they have been militarily obliterated, with zero chance of a comeback, and yet they publicly state that they are only 'looking at our proposal.' WRONG!!!" Trump wrote on Truth Social on Thursday."*
291. April 5, 2026, France24, 'Trump draws criticism with fiery Easter message on Iran'.
292. March 25, 2026, Iran International (iranintl.com), 'Iran state TV analyst suggests seizing UAE, Bahrain coasts in response to US strikes'.
293. April 3, 2026, Asharq Al-Awsat, 'Iran's Former Top Diplomat Urges Deal with US to End War'.
294. July 3, 2014, Daily Mail, 'Bow to me or die in an ocean of BLOOD: Why Genghis Khan, throat slitter supreme, was even nastier than you thought'.

295. Oct. 12, 2018, Arab News, 'Iran's nuclear defiance should not be ignored': *"More than a decade ago [in 2002], the opposition National Council for Resistance of Iran (NCRI) revealed that Tehran was conducting secret nuclear activities at two major sites, Natanz and Arak."*
296. March 31, 2026, BBC, 'How the US could try to seize Iran's Kharg Island': *"Around 90% of Iran's oil exports pass through Kharg Island."*
297. March 27, 2026, Reuters, 'Gulf states tell US ending the war is not enough, Iran's capabilities must be degraded'.
298. Jan. 27, 2010, New York Times, 'In Davos, Signs of Shift in Global Power': *"[Nicolas Sarkozy, president of France 2007-2012, at Davos 2004:] The G-20 is a harbinger of global governance in the 21st century..."* The G20 was pushed for by the secretive "Shadow G8" since the 1990s, involving Klaus Schwab's old mentor, Henry Kissinger. Sarkozy was a Davos "Young Global Leader" for 1992, alongside future heads of state Tony Blair, Gordon Brown, Angela Merkel, Jose Maria Aznar, and Jose Manuel Barroso.
299. *) Jan. 27, 2026, The Guardian, 'Disappeared bodies, mass burials and '30,000 dead': what is the truth of Iran's death toll? Testimony from medics, morgue and graveyard staff reveals huge state effort to conceal systematic killing of protesters'.
    *) Feb. 20, 2026, NewsNationNow.com, 'Imprisoned Iranian protesters are being tortured and raped, sources say'.
300. Jan. 16, 2026, BBC, 'Exiled crown prince urges world to help protesters topple Iran's government'.
301. *) Jan. 8, 2026 Youtube upload by 'PowNews', 'Iran massaal de straat op tegen islamitisch regime: 'Levensgevaarlijk!'' ('Iran takes to the streets en masse against Islamic regime: 'Life-threatening!'): *" [Narrator:] Bloody nationwide protests have been underway in Iran for ten days now. Thirty people have already died. Is this the end of the Ayatollah regime? And why do we hear so incredibly little here in the Netherlands? [Writer and Comite Iran Vrij director Keyvan Shahbazi:] They wanted me to go to the embassy and report there. Yes, they said to me, "We know everything about you. Don't think for a moment that we don't know where you live and where you work.""*
    *) Jan. 29, 2026 Youtube upload by 'PowNews', 'Stichting VluchtelingenWerk negeert slachtingen in Iran; dj's vertrekken!' ('RefugeeAid Foundation ignores massacres in Iran; DJs are leaving!'): *"[Narrator:] For years, there have been thousands of pro-Palestine demonstrations worldwide. And now things have really escalated in Iran. Estimates suggest that more than 30,000 people have been killed. And it is quiet. How is that possible?"*
    [ARSHAM POUR:] It's a really, really, really hard situation for us. We heard that one of our childhood friends has been killed, one of our relatives has been killed, and every single family that we know lost

someone. We have seen crazy, crazy footages. ... Dead bodies were on top of each other...

[We broke with Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk, because] before, they talked about Gaza, they talked about Ukraine. [But] there was complete silence [on Iran], nothing. They didn't even interview any Iranians to let the board [of directors] hear their opinions. So I was like, "I'm working with this organization for five years. Why they are silent?" So I immediately commented, "Why you guys are silent?" And I sent them the email and the response was really shocking. What they said was that, "We are not taking sides and we are not giving a political statement." Exactly, [people are getting murdered and tortured and they don't take any side], so... It's regime versus people. There is no side. It's just innocent people are dying on the street. So when they give that comment, it really made us upset and we felt like we know we don't want to be part of such an organization anymore where the human right is selected based on their political views. ...

[ARMIA POUR:] This is not about taking sides. ... Everyone has lost someone. So from my point of view, the numbers should be way more [than 6,000 deaths.] ... If you were arrested and coming out, do the blood check, because they inject you with something and then you go out after a few days, you die, and then it's not the government's fault anymore."

302. March 15, 2018, BBC, 'Saudi Arabia pledges to create a nuclear bomb if Iran does'.
303. Feb. 10, 2026, Bloomberg, 'Turkey Says It Could Be Dragged Into Nuclear Arms Race Over Iran'.
304. April 1, 2026, Eurasian Times, 'Japan Could Surpass U.S. & Russia With 5,500 Nuclear Warheads From 44.4 Tons Plutonium: Chinese Media'.